2/6 24

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

DA 317.2 .C8 S9 1853 v.1
Strype, John, 1643-1737.
Memorials of the Most
reverend father in God

Shelf..........

copy 1

MEMORIALS

OF

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

VOL. I.

MEMORIALS

OF

THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD

THOMAS CRANMER,

SOMETIME LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

WHEREIN

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH,

And the Reformation of it, during the Primacy of the said Archbishop, are greatly illustrated; and many singular matters relating thereunto, now first published (1694). *In Three Books.*

COLLECTED CHIEFLY FROM RECORDS, REGISTERS, AUTHENTIC LETTERS, AND OTHER ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS.

BY JOHN STRYPE, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN TWO VOLUMES,

BY

PHILIP EDWARD BARNES, ESQ., B.A., F.L.S.,

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & CO., FARRINGDON STREET.
1853.

PROPERTY OF
REC. FEB 1881
LIBRARY.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The works of Strype need no encomium or elucidation from the pen of an editor. They have long been considered as amongst the best authorities, and as forming a most valuable portion of the history of the Reformation of religion in this country, no less than as of standard excellence, inasmuch as the narratives of the most interesting events in the annals of our country, were based by this author upon documentary evidence, and drawn from original MSS., the greater part of which are still extant.

Valuable, however, as Strype's works must ever be considered, they have hitherto been of little service to the masses of our population, by whom their existence is almost unknown; indeed, their circulation has chiefly been confined to the wealthy, for even the clergy have been compelled to resort to public libraries and literary institutions to obtain the means of perusal, the outlay for their purchase being utterly beyond the means of the greater number of that useful and important body. It may not be too much perhaps to assert, that had such an elaborate history of the Reformation as is contained in the entire works of Strype been in general circulation amongst the clergy, it would have been well nigh impossible that so many of them could of late years have been so fearfully misled by the insinuations of designing men, as to have been perverted by the doctrines of that Church, the misdoings of which, previously to the æra of the Reformation, Strype has so distinctly traced and unfolded.

In the hope, therefore, that the republication of the entire works of Strype, at a price which will place them within the reach of every person who desires to become acquainted with the facts of the Reformation, may be the means to a more general knowledge and understanding of that important event, the first volume of the "Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer," is presented to the public. The second and concluding volume will be issued in the month of August.

Should the reception, which these volumes may meet with, appear to justify a continuance of "the Works of Strype," they will be followed (at the same price *per volume*, and in the same form), at intervals of about two months, until the entire series is completed, by the publication of "The Ecclesiastical Memorials," and "The Annals of the Reformation;" "The Lives of Archbishops Parker, Grindal, Whitgift," &c. &c.

The foot-notes, introduced in this volume, will indicate the manner, by which it is intended to illustrate this Edition, while the documents quoted by the author, and contained in the Appendices, will be collated and verified whenever they can be found and consulted. Any errors that may be found therein will also be corrected. Those errors are chiefly to be attributed to the inaccuracy of the copyists whom the author employed, and are still perpetuated in other Editions. The greatest pains will be taken to ensure accuracy in this respect, and to make this Edition as perfect as possible.

P. E. BARNES.

LINCOLN'S INN,
June 1, 1853.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. FEB 1881

TO THE

MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

JOHN,

BY THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,[1]

PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND, AND METROPOLITAN;
AND ONE OF THEIR MAJESTIES' MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCIL.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE

To pardon the presumption of the obscure person that dedicates this book to your grace, for the sake of the renowned man it treats of, viz. one of your illustrious predecessors, an archbishop of Canterbury, that hath deserved so eminently of that see, nay, and of the whole British Church; I may say, that deserved best of any archbishop before him, that wore that mitre; to whose solid learning, deliberation, and indefatigable pains, both the kings and people of this realm owe their deliverance from the long and cruel bondage of Rome. For it is true what the Romanists say in obloquy of this archbishop, and we Protestants say i to his eternal fame, that he was the first of all the archbishops of Canterbury that made a defection from the Papal chair; thereby vindicating this crown from the base dependence upon a foreign jurisdiction. But whereas Parsons saith, that "this was the first change of religion in any archbishop of Canterbury from the beginning unto his days;" this is not so true; for sundry of Archbishop Cranmer's predecessors (to look no further than two or three hundred years backward) were of different judgments from the church of Rome in some points. His immediate predecessor, Warham, approved of the king's title of supreme head of the church under Christ, in his own kingdom, against the doctrine of the pope's universal authority. And, a century of years before him, Archbishop Chichely, though he were made the pope's legate, refused to exercise his power legantine, further than he should be authorized thereunto by the king. And Archbishop Islip, as long before him, disliked of dissolving those marriages that were contracted by such as had before vowed the single life. For though he laid a punishment upon a countess of Kent, who, being a widow, and then professed, afterwards secretly married to a certain knight, named Abrincourt; yet he divorced them not, but permitted them to live together. And the judgment of Archbishop Arundel, who lived in King Richard the Second's reign, was for the translation of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, and for the laity's use thereof. For he, preaching the funeral sermon of Queen Anne, the beloved wife of that king, after she deceased at Sheen, in the year 1392, commended her, as for her other virtuous accomplishments, so particularly for her study of the holy Scriptures, and of the sense of them; and for having them in the vulgar tongue; as I find by an ancient MS.[2] fragment, writ near three hundred years ago, formerly belonging to the church of Worcester, in these words following:—

---

[1] [Archbishop Tillotson.]

---

[1] In his Three Conversions, [part i. c. ix. § 27].
[2] E. Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. No. ccccxxv. I].

Also the bushop of Caunterbury, Thomas of Arundel, that now is, sey a sermon at Westminster, thereas was many an hundred of people, at the buryeng of Quene Anne (of whose sowle God have mercy). And in his commendation of her he seyd, that it was more joy of her, than of any woman, that ever he knew. For notwithstanding that she was alien born [*being the daughter of the Emperor Charles IV.*], *she had on English al the iiij gospels, with the doctors upon hem. And he seyd, that she sent them unto him. And he seyd, that they were good and true, and commended her, in that she was so great a lady, and also an alyan, and wolde study so holy, so vertuouse bokes. And he blamed in his sermon sharply the negligence of the prelates, and other men, &c.*

So that it is not true what Parsons saith, if he mean, that no archbishops of Canterbury, before Cranmer, varied from the church of Rome in any of her doctrines. But true it is, though not so much to their credits, that none of them, however sensible they were of the Roman errors and superstitions, did in good earnest bestir themselves to set this church free of them, before our above-named archbishop (being the sixty-eighth from Augustine the monk), resolutely and bravely undertook and effected it. Indeed they spent not their zeal, their treasure, and their interest this way so much, as in contending about superiority and their prerogatives, in exempting their clergy from the cognizance of the temporal magistrate, in applications to, and courting of, the bishops of Rome, in persecuting those they called heretics, in eternizing their own names, by founding religious houses, and building stately palaces, and shrines, and in exhibiting themselves in great worldly pomp and appearance.

But blessed be God for Archbishop Cranmer; by means of whose reformation succeeded a series of better, though not so splendid, archbishops. Who made conscience of minding things more suitable to their high vocation, and the spiritual trust committed to them: men that regarded little or nothing the vain shows of exterior grandeur and glory, nor sought great things for themselves; but, with their great predecessor St. Paul (on whom lay the care of all the churches), spent and wore out themselves in the restoration of the kingdom of Christ, so happily begun by the said Archbishop Cranmer in this island. Such were Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, the three first Protestant archbishops next after him; what he planted they watered, and God blessed increase to. Whose most excellent lives and conducts in the government of this church, as well as in their own more private and domestic conversation; their rare piety, prudence, patience, courage, and activity; I can scarcely temper my pen from making excursions into. Of which I could fill even volumes (had I leisure, favour, and countenance), from those large collections which I have for divers years been storing up with great delight, partly out of their own original letters, and partly from other MSS. in their times.

But besides these first archbishops during the long reign of Queen Elizabeth, who by their care and diligence established and settled that Reformation, of which Archbishop Cranmer laid the first stones, we are beholden unto the same archbishop for all the rest of the worthy and painful prelates of that metropolitical see, who have taken care of this excellently reformed church, even unto your grace, whose deserts towards this church and the Reformation have raised you to sit in Archbishop Cranmer's chair; though with as much reluctancy in you as was in him. Of your grace's endowments to qualify you for this most eminent station, I will be wholly silent; knowing how abhorrent your generous nature is from reading or hearing your own commendations.

Nor, my lord, is this my end in this my dedication: but this it is, that you would so far encourage these my weak and imperfect labours (done out of a good intent), as to cast a favourable eye upon them, for the sake of your glorious predecessor, the subject of this book; and to repute me among the number,

May it please your Grace,
Of your most humble,
And most obedient Servants,

JOHN STRYPE.

PREFACE.

I THINK it fit, by way of preface to these Memorials, to admonish the reader of a few things preparatory to the perusal thereof: as, what it was put me at first upon making these collections concerning Archbishop Cranmer and the state of the church in his time; what induced me to make them public; and what credit may be given to them; with some other occasional matters.

I. As to the first, I have been for a long time not a little addicted to read whatsoever I could of the Reformation of this famous church; that I might truly understand, for what reasons it was at first attempted; in what methods it proceeded; by what men it was chiefly managed and carried on; and how it stood in truth as to its doctrine, discipline, and government, reputation, learning, piety, and such like, in its first establishment, and the earlier times of it. For which purpose I did not only read over what we have in print of these matters, but, for more satisfaction, I was carried on to look into MSS. whether registers, records, letters, instruments, and such like: a great sort of which by providence fell into my hands. And, besides them, I have turned over many more in libraries and elsewhere; from whence I made transcriptions, extracts, and collections, for my own use and satisfaction: which swelled to no little bulk. And while I was doing this, I took always a more curious view into the lives, manners, and doings, learning, virtues, and abilities, of the chief leading men, whether archbishops and bishops, or other churchmen, of whom we have but little account extant, though many of them very great and good men; little more remaining of some of them than their names.

The reverence I bore in my mind to Archbishop Cranmer, the father of the Reformation here in England, and the first of that ancient metropolitan see that so bravely shook off the pope and his appendages, inclined me especially to gather up what notices I could of him. Afterwards, as my leisure served me, out of my indigested mass of notes, I compiled into some order memorials of him, and of the affairs of the church during his primacy; in which he for the most part was concerned, and bore a great share with King Henry, and the Lord Crumwel, his Vicegerent in spirituals. After some years, these memorials lying by me, I enlarged considerably, and digested them into annals, and had thoughts of making them public, being excited and encouraged thereunto by my friends, who were privy to these my doings.

II. And indeed many considerations induced me hereunto: as, in general, the great benefit of reading histories of former times; which what that is, take in the words of John Fox; "For [if] the things which be first—are to be preferred before those which be later, then is the reading of histories much necessary in the church, to know what went before, and what followed after. And therefore, not without cause, 'historia' in old authors is called, The witness of times, the light of verity, the life of memory, the teacher of life, and shower of antiquity, etc., without the knowledge whereof man's life is blind, and soon may fall into any kind of error; as by manifest experience we have to see in these desolate later times of the church, when the bishops of Rome, under colour of antiquity, have turned truth into heresy, and brought such new-found devices of strange doctrine and religion, as [before], in the former ages of the church, were never heard of: and all through ignorance of times, and for lack of true history."[1] And therefore the use of history being so considerable, historians in some kingdoms have been maintained by public encouragement. And so the writer of the Epistle to King Edward, before Erasmus' Paraphrase Englished, propounded once to that king, "That there should be a public salary allotted to some able persons, to translate good books, and to write chronicles, for bestowing so great a benefit on the commonwealth."[1]

---

[1] In his Protestation to the whole Church of England. [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, Prefaces, &c. vol. i. p. xix.]

But particularly the history of the Church, and matters relating to religion, have a more special benefit, as being conversant about spiritual things, which are weightier by far, and concern us more a great deal, than temporal. But, the more is the pity, in this sort of history there is a greater defect than in the other; I speak of our own nation; for though the history of the state, in the last age, was excellently done by the pens of the Lord Herbert, and Mr. Cambden; yet the matters of the church they professedly declined, or did but touch at; the former saying expressly, "His intention was not in a history to discuss theological matters, as holding it sufficient to have pointed at the places where they are controverted."[2] And the latter in his History, as often as he came to matters of the church, tells us, that he left his readers to the ecclesiastical historian; which hath made me wonder at, and apt to accuse the slothfulness of that age, that, during all the time King Henry, King Edward, and Queen Mary, wherein religion was so tossed about, and took up so much of those reigns, there is no one ecclesiastical history thereof written, except that of the diligent and learned Mr. Fox; and, during the long reign of Queen Elizabeth and King James, I think, none at all. Till of late years, when, by length of time, and destruction of many original MSS. by the civil wars, divers remarkable transactions were buried and lost, some few learned men employed themselves in collecting and publishing what memorials of religion and the church they could retrieve; as namely, Dr. Fuller, Dr. Heylin, and especially Dr. Burnet, now the right reverend bishop of Sarum; to whom the English church must be ever beholden for his great and happy pains contributed hereunto. But yet there be good gleanings after these writers; and many things of remark there are, relating to the church in those three busy reigns of Henry, Edward, and Mary, whereof these historians are either wholly silent, or speak imperfectly, or erroneously; some whereof in my searches I have met with, which I have disposed in these Memorials.

---

[1] [Preface to the King's Majesty, vol. i. p. 11.]

[2] Page 418, Edition 1672.

But besides the general benefit of history, especially ecclesiastical, this particular history now recommended unto the English nation may produce this good effect, to make us value and esteem, as we ought, our Reformed religion, when we see by what just and fair ways it went on, and how it prevailed, like Christianity at first, notwithstanding the great opposition it met with; and what sort of men they were, such as Gardiner and Bonner, who especially set themselves to stop it.

Moreover, reading the lives of exemplary men, and such as were famous in their generation, hath a great virtue in it to influence the manners of men. Their wise sayings, their discreet behaviour, their just management of matters committed to their trust; their zeal, their charity, their awe of God, their contempt of the world, and such like, are not only delightful to read or hear, but do insensibly instil into men's minds a secret approbation thereof, and draw them on to an imitation. This land hath produced many admirable men; the knowledge of whom, and the benefit of whose examples, is utterly lost, for want of some writers to leave their memory unto the world. It was a thing complained of in the last age, "that as that age abounded more in writers than any age before it, so there were very few that set themselves to pen the lives of excellent men; as Samuel, the learned and worthy son of John Fox, spake: but he ever thought it, as he said, most unjust, notwithstanding, to deprive the world of the memory of matters done by them, by whose labours and worthy deeds the common state of the country was so much bettered."[1] And if the use of history, as the same author saith, is to form the lives and manners of men, that being the chief end of history; then, I add, no part of history doth more promote this than the history of the deeds of famous men.

It was another great inducement to me to let this work see the light, to be grateful to the memory of this holy prelate, that hath so well deserved of this church; and to whom, under God, she oweth that excellent constitution and reformed state, in which she is; which cost him so dear, so many pensive thoughts, so many long hours' study, so many consultations and debates with learned men, so much correspondence abroad, so many speeches, arguments, and strugglings in the Parliament, in the Convocation, before the king, the clergy, the people; so much danger, and trouble, and envy, and reproach, and at last his dearest blood. Posterity would be highly injurious to such a person as this, if he should not be recorded with all due respect and honour. It was a commendable practice of the ancient Persians, to write in records the names and good deeds of such as had deserved well of the king and kingdom, to remain for ever. And these records kings themselves did sometimes use to read. The king Ahasuerus called one night for them to be read to him, to entertain his waking hours (Esther vi). And Xerxes, in an epistle of his to Pausanias, extant in Thucydides, told him that "his good deed was upon record in his palace for ever."[1] For these records were esteemed so precious, that they were kept within the walls of the palace. And this custom of writing up the remembrance of men of merit seemed also to be among the Jews. Thus it is said of Judas Maccabeus, that "the remembrance of him was a blessing for ever."[2] To which does, I suppose ספר זכרון that "book of remembrance," or record, allude (in Mal. iii. 16), "that was written for those that feared God, and thought on his name." And surely it is agreeable to God's will that this piece of gratitude should be shown to men of singular virtue deceased, to keep their names and good deeds upon record, for posterity to know, and to thank God for.

---

[1] Life of John Fox.

And this office of love and duty seems highly convenient to be done towards Archbishop Cranmer, that something might appear in the world for his vindication, under those many base aspersions, and lying insinuations, that are and have been printed by Papists, to defame and blacken him to posterity.[3] One of them hath these words (which show that he cared not what he said, so he might but throw his dirt upon the chief lights of the Reformation): "The very pillars of this rank, [which he names to be] Luther, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Rogers, Farrar, Taylor, Tyndal, all married priests and friars [but some of them never were friars, and others never married], were men given to their sensualities, both of women, and other like their commodities, after the fashion of other ordinary men. Neither is there recounted any one eminent action in all their lives, that I have read, either of chastening their bodies, mortifying their appetites, contemning the world and the pleasures thereof, while they might have and use the same; or finally, any more excellent spirit in them above the rest, or of any supernatural concurrence of God with their actions in any one thing." But did he converse so much in Fox, as to undertake in one or two books to answer and confute him and his martyrs; and yet doth he meet with nothing there of none of these men in that Martyrology but what was "ordinary to other men," and that showed not some "more excellent spirit" to be in them? It is a sign he read but little there, or read with a cankered mind. This ensuing book shall effectually confute these misreports and slanders of Cranmer, one of these pillars, as he calls them; and shall abundantly make it appear, that he was no sensualist, nor addicted (notwithstanding his high place) to the pleasures and commodities of this world; and that his life shone bright by his many eminent actions of piety, mortification, contempt of the world; and that he was of a "more excellent spirit" than that of the ordinary rank of men; and that for some ages there scarce arose his fellow; and finally, that he must needs have some "supernatural concurrence" and mighty aid of God's grace with him, in many of the affairs that passed through his hands.

---

[1] *Κείσεταί σοι εὐεργεσία ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ οἴκῳ εἰς ἀεὶ ἀνάγραπτος.* [lib. i. cap. 129.]

[2] *Ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ εἰς εὐλογίαν.* 1 Mac. iii. 7.

[3] Parson's Three Conversions, part iii. p. 84.

III. The third thing remains (which is indeed the main matter that makes a history of any account), and that is, what credit may be given to what I have writ; for if it stand not upon the foot of truth, it is not history, but a romance, a legend, a mere tale. And here I remember what John Fox said to Alan Cope, concerning a history-controller, which is as true of a history-writer:[1]—"If you will be a controller in story-matters, diligence is required, and great searching out of books and authors, not only of our time, but of all ages. And especially where matters of religion are touched, pertaining to the church, it is not sufficient to say what Fabian or what Hall saith; but [the] records must be sought, [the] registers must be turned over, letters also and ancient instruments ought to be perused, and authors with the same compared; finally, the writers among themselves one to be conferred with another; and so with judgment [matters are] to be weighed; with diligence to be laboured; and with simplicity, pure from all addition and partiality, to be uttered."

Now to measure myself with this: diligence and faithfulness, I trust, hath not been wanting in me; I have been governed by a hearty desire and love of truth; I have read over such printed books as are of the best credit and vogue, and I have often compared them with good MSS. especially when I have had occasion to make use of them; which I have done but sparingly and briefly, that I might not cumber the book with what hath been known and written afore. But the collections I have here made, and do publish to the world, are chiefly from manuscript records, registers, letters, orders of council, original and authentic. For, besides Archbishop Cranmer's Register, in a great folio, in which I have bestowed some considerable time, I have had the perusal of several rare papers (volumes I may say), of Sir John Cotton, preserved in his invaluable library; and of Archbishop Parker, that great antiquarian, collected by him, and now remaining in the private library of Benet College in Cambridge; among which there is a writing, intituled, "A declaration concerning the progeny, with the manners and trade of life, and bringing up, of the most reverend father in God, Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury; and by what order and means he came to his preferments and dignities." Which I perceive was drawn up by Cranmer's secretary, at the desire of Archbishop Parker, and for his use. I have been conversant in what remaineth of the papers of John Fox, communicated to me by the favour of my good friend William Willys, of Hackney, esquire. Among which there is a MS. life of Cranmer; Annals, writ by an Augustine Monk of Canterbury, from the year 1532 to 1558: many letters of Fox, and other learned men, to him, relating to the affairs or afflictions of the church in those times; and abundance more, too long here to be inserted. I have consulted also many MSS. of great worth, originally belonging to the Lord Treasurer Burleigh's secretary, imparted to me by Sir William Hickes, of Low-Leyton in Essex, knight and baronet, wherein are divers of Archbishop Cranmer's letters, written by his own pen. By the kindness of the Reverend Mr. Nicolas Battely of Kent, and his great readiness and zeal to forward my design, I have received a great many material *excerpta* out of the registers and records of the cathedral church of Canterbury, and out of other books and MSS. William Petyt, of the Inner Temple, esquire, and keeper of the Tower records, did with great humanity communicate unto me his collection of excellent papers, contained in two large volumes: which though in these Memorials I have made but little use of, yet may be admirably subservient to me, or whosoever's lot else it may happen to fall to, to give the world some account of Queen Elizabeth's archbishops, and the church affairs in their times. In this catalogue of friends and assistants, I must mention also the Reverend Dr. Thomas Smith, and Mr. Henry Wharton; Mr. Laughton, keeper of the public library in Cambridge, and Mr. Harrison, fellow of Sidney College in that university. Unto all these gentlemen now named, I do here (as I ought in gratitude) publicly acknowledge myself beholden.

---

[1] Acts and Mon. vol. i. p. 532, Edit. 1610 [vol. iii. pp. 376–7].

I did also consult the MS. library at Lambeth, by the favourable permission of the last, and the present, archbishop of Canterbury.[1] But though there be divers shelves of very choice MSS., yet I found little or nothing there serviceable to my purpose; unless it should please God to lengthen my life and health, to write in this method concerning Archbishop Whitgift. Neither was I successful in inquiries, which I procured friends to make, from such as were relations of the archbishop, in any matters or notices concerning him. There is one Mr. Cartwright, of Nottinghamshire, that is an heir of that ancient family of the Cranmers, a worthy gentleman, and now, or late, justice of the peace for that county; who, being made acquainted with my design, and moved to impart any letters or writings that might be of use thereunto, answered a friend, that he was plundered in the late civil wars of abundance of papers, and not a few to that effect; but that now he had not anything left to contribute but his own good wishes to the undertaker.

---

[1] [Archbishops Sancroft and Tillotson.]

But still further, for the better satisfying the readers in the truth of what I write, I have, according to a good practice first begun by Mr. Somner, of Canterbury,[1] cast the most material records and original letters together by themselves in an Appendix, that those that please may read them there, rather than in the body of the story, where it might too much interrupt the thread of the discourse, and make the reading more tedious. Which Appendix will serve both as a proof of the history, and moreover as a repository for many choice monuments of antiquity; which otherwise, being in loose papers, and private studies, might in time be utterly extinguished, and irrecoverably lost.

And I do here protest once for all, that I have not inserted into this book any one single historical passage out of mine own head, but such as I have either found in some credible published history, or in some old book printed in those times, or the prefaces and epistles to them; or, lastly, in some good MS. or other.

I have digested these memorials and annals, and have laid matters under their respective years, and months, and days, as near as I could: sometimes indeed I have been left to conjecture at the true time; which I have done with as much care and exactness as, by considering all circumstances, I could. Yet herein I am not so confident, but that I may sometimes perhaps make a mistake: and if I do so, it will, I hope, be excused to me, considering that I was fain oftentimes to go by guess (grounded however upon the best probability I could make), the papers I used being not seldom without date, sometimes of the year, sometimes of the month, and sometimes of both.

---

[1] In his Antiq. of Canterbury.

I thought it not amiss (though I have not observed it done in any other history), to set down under every year what bishops diocesan and suffragan were consecrated in the province of Canterbury, and by whom. And I am jealous some of the suffragans may be omitted by me; which defect must be attributed to the registers rather than to me. I have taken particular heed to the convocations, and to what was done in them. And because the affairs of the English church have such a near relation unto the archbishops of the church, so as their histories are but maimed and imperfect without some respect had to those affairs, I have diligently interwoven many ecclesiastical emergencies into this History; and a great many more I have been forced to omit, though well worthy the public, lest the volume might swell too much.

If any might perhaps deem this a needless work, the life of this archbishop having been writ already in the Book of Martyrs, and the British Antiquities; I answer such, that I have therefore been short, and it may be silent, in some things more fully and largely treated of elsewhere: but here are numberless notices given concerning the archbishop, some which are nowhere else, others very imperfectly, observed; besides the narrations of the state, and history of the church (which are everywhere interposed), in most of which the archbishop bore a part.

The cathedral church of Canterbury, now called Christ Church, I have in some places styled Trinity Church, because I so find it named in those particular records I make use of in those places; and, it seems, in some of the first years of our archbishop, it ordinarily went by that old name.

My style may seem rough and unpolished, and the phrases here and there uncouth; the reason of which is, because, I confess, I have often taken the very expressions and words of the papers I have used; and so may fall sometimes into obsolete terms, and a style not so acceptable to the present age, whose language is refined from what it was a hundred and fifty or forty years ago. But I have chosen to do this, that I might keep the nearer truth, and lest that, by varying of the language, I might perhaps sometimes vary from the true meaning of my writer. And, in truth, he that is a lover of antiquity loves the very language and phrases of antiquity.

The reader will find some few things here, which are already published in the late Specimen put forth by Anthony Harmer; he and I, it seems, lighting unwittingly upon the same records, to wit, King Edward's Council-Book, and the register of Christ Church, Cant[erbury]. Nor could I strike out of my book what I found published in the said Specimen, having fully finished it, and the copy being under the press some weeks before that book came forth, and the matters there related interwoven into the contexture of my history.

And now, after all this pains that I have taken in fulfilling this task (which I assure the readers have not been small, nor of a few years), let me not for every little slip fall under their censure and reproach, but rather let them use me with gentleness and charity; considering how few, though much abler, will trouble themselves to labour and drudge, and take journeys, and be at expenses, in making such collections for the public good. It calls to mind what happened upon the death of the laborious antiquary John Stow, who had been a collector of matters for the English history seven and forty years, and died 1605, and had all the collections of Reiner Wolf (another historian and a printer in King Edward the Sixth's days); and, if he had lived but one year longer, intended to have published his long labours: but, after his death, there was not a man to be found to take the small pains to review his papers, and fit them for the press. Many indeed were talked of to do it, both persons of quality among the laity and clergy (for the world had great and earnest expectation to see Stow in print), but when they were spoke to to take the good work in hand, some of them said, that they thought the giving out of their names was rather done by secret enemies, on purpose to draw them into capital displeasure, and to bring their names and lives into a general question. Others said, that they who did such a work must flatter, which they could not; neither wilfully would they leave a scandal unto their posterity. Another said, he could not see how in any civil action a man should spend his travail, time, and money worse, than in that which acquires no regard or reward, except backbiting and detraction. And one among the rest swore an oath, and said, he thanked God that he was not yet mad, to waste his time, spend two hundred pounds a year (which it seems Stow had done), trouble himself and all his friends, only to gain assurance of endless reproach, loss of liberty, and bring all his days in question. Yet at last one Edward Howes undertook it, and effected it: but it happened just so to him, having been intolerably abused and scandalized for his labour. So slothful and backward are most to take pains in works of this nature, and so apt to censure those that do. I hope I shall meet (if not with thanks, at least), with more candid men, and better usage.

But whatever happens, I shall arm myself with patience to undergo it, since I intend nothing hereby but to be serviceable unto my country, and God's church, and to justify the excellent Reformation of it in these kingdoms; and, finally, to do right unto the memory of that truly great and good archbishop of Canterbury. And thus, recommending the success of this work unto God's blessing, I here make an end.

J. STRYPE.

LOW-LEYTON.
Sept. 29, 1693.

I desire the reader to take notice, that, when I quote Fox's Acts and Monuments, it is the edition in the year 1610. And when the Life of King Henry VIII. by the Lord Herbert, it is the edition of 1672. And when the History of the Reformation by Bishop Burnet, it is that of the year 1681.[1] Farewell.

---

[1] [Fox's Acts and Monuments referred to in this edition is that of London (Seeley's), 1843–49. The Oxford edition of Burnet's History of the Reformation, 1829, is followed, instead of the folio edition of 1681, used by Strype. Dr. Bliss' edition of Wood's Athenæ (Oxon.) has also been consulted instead of the folio edition.]—EDITOR.

PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

Anno 1489, 1503, 1511, 1516, 1523, 1529, 1530.

Cranmer's Birth, Education, and Rise.

A WORTHY work to revive his memory. His family. Account of his younger years. Sent to Cambridge, anno 1503. Sets himself to study the Scripture. Is made doctor of divinity. Marries. Refuses to go to Wolsey's college, Oxon. He is made one of the university examiners. The king's great cause first proposed to the universities. The occasion of his rise. His opinion of the king's cause. The king sends for him. Suitably placed with the earl of Ormond. Friendship and correspondence between the earl and Cranmer. A providence in his being placed here. Cranmer disputes at Cambridge. Grows dear to the king and his court.—*Page* 1–8.

CHAPTER II.

Anno 1530.

Pole's Book about the King's Matrimony.

Pole's book against the king's dissolving his marriage. Cranmer peruses it. His account of it. His censure thereof.—*Page* 8–12.

CHAPTER III.

Anno 1530, 1531, 1532.

Cranmer's Embassies.

He is employed in embassies. To the pope. Offers him a dispute in favour of the king's cause. To the emperor. Cornelius Agrippa gained by Cranmer to the king's cause. Becomes acquainted with

Osiander; and marries his kinswoman. Treats with the emperor about the contract of traffic; and about sending supplies against the Turk. Sends the king the news in those parts; and the proclamation for a general council; and the tax of the states of the empire. He goes in an embassy to the duke of Saxony, and other Protestant princes.—*Page* 13–19.

CHAPTER IV.

Anno 1532, 1533.

Cranmer made Archbishop of Canterbury.

Made archbishop of Canterbury. His dignities before he was archbishop. Archbishop Warham foretells a Thomas to succeed him. Archbishop Warham for the king's supremacy. Cranmer's testimony of Warham. A reflection upon a passage relating to Cranmer in Harpsfield's History. Cranmer tries to evade the archbishopric. Declares the reason thereof to the king. The archbishop's brother is made archdeacon of Canterbury. The king linked Cranmer with him in all his proceedings about Queen Katharine. The king and archbishop appeal from the pope to a general council. The king writes to Dr. Bonner, his ambassador in that behalf. The archbishop is consecrated. The pope's bulls. The archbishop surrenders them to the king. The method of the consecration. The archbishop's oath for the temporalities. The archbishop pronounceth the divorce. The archbishop's judgment of the marriage.—*Page* 19–30.

CHAPTER V.

Anno 1533.

The Archbishop visits his Diocese.

The archbishop forbids preaching. Visits his diocese. The delusion of a nun in Kent. The archbishop appeals from the pope. The archbishop's letter to Bonner. Disputes in the parliament against the pope's supremacy. Licenses for chapels.—*Page* 30–34.

CHAPTER VI.

Anno 1534.

The Archbishop presseth the Translation of the Bible.

The archbishop labours the reformation of the church. What he did this convocation. A book for preaching, and the beads. Dispersed by the archbishop to all the bishops. The archbishop of York preaches at York. The clergy and universities subscribe against the pope. Cranmer and others administer the oath of succession to the clergy: and to Sir Thomas More, who refused it. Cranmer's argument with him. More offers to swear to the succession itself. Bishop Fisher offers the same. The archbishop writes to Crumwel in their behalf. The archbishop's endeavour to save the lives of More and Fisher.—*Page* 34–40.

CHAPTER VII.

Anno 1534.

The Archbishop visits the Diocese of Norwich.

A *præmunire* brought against Bishop Nix. The archbishop visits this bishop's see. The bishop of Norwich a persecutor. Goodrick, Lee, and Salcot, consecrated bishops.—*Page* 41–43.

CHAPTER VIII.

Anno 1535.

The Archbishop preacheth at Canterbury.

The archbishop preaches up the king's supremacy at Canterbury. A prior preaches against him: whom he convents before him. The archbishop acquaints the king with the matter. A provincial visitation. Winchester herein opposeth him. The archbishop's vindication of his title of primate. The bishop of London refuseth his visitation; and protests against him. Cranmer sends him a part of the New Testament to translate: and his answer. Lawney's jest upon Bishop Stokesly. Who this Lawney was.—*Page* 43–50.

CHAPTER IX.

Anno 1535.

Monasteries visited.

Monasteries visited. The archbishop for their dissolution. The visitors' informations. Bishops diocesan and suffragan consecrated. Suffragan bishops usual in the realm. Bishops without title. Nicholas Shaxton, Edward Fox, William Barlow, George Brown. A memorial of the good services of Archbishop Brown in Ireland. Thomas Manning. John Salisbury.—*Page* 50–56.

CHAPTER X.

Anno 1536.

The Audience Court.

The archbishop's audience court struck at. The archbishop defends it. The archbishop promoting a reformation in the convocation. *Page* 56, 57.

CHAPTER XI.

Anno 1536.

Articles of Religion.

Articles published and recommended by the king. The original thereof. The original sent into the north to show to the rebels. The contents of them. Articles of faith. Articles relating to ceremonies. A conjecture that the pen of the archbishop was here.—*Page* 58–63.

CHAPTER XII.

Anno 1536.

Cranmer's Judgment about some Cases of Matrimony.

Two remarkable books published. 1. The book of Articles. 2. A book against the pope, called, The Bishops' Book. Certain cases of matrimony put to the archbishop. His solution. Refuseth to grant a dispensation for the marriage of a relation. His letter thereupon. He restrains the number of proctors: which some complain of to the parliament. The archbishop divorceth Queen Anne. A license for a chapel. Bucer this year dedicates a book to the archbishop. Bishops consecrated: Richard Sampson, William Rugge, Robert Warton.—*Page* 64–73.

CHAPTER XIII.

Anno 1537.

The Bishops' Book.

The Bishops' Book by the archbishop's means. Winchester's opposition. The king makes animadversions upon it. Published. How esteemed. Enlarged and reprinted. Some account of the foresaid book. Names of the composers.—*Page* 73–79.

CHAPTER XIV.

Anno 1537.

The Archbishop visits his Diocese.

Goes down into his diocese. Gets a license to visit. The vicar of Croydon. The archbishop visits his diocese. What course he took for the preventing of superstition.—*Page* 79–82.

CHAPTER XV.

Anno 1537.

The Bible printed.

His joy at the publishing the English Bible. Presents one by Crumwel to the king. Cranmer's letters to Crumwel. Some further particulars concerning this edition of the Bible. The printer's thanks and requests to Crumwel. Grafton to Crumwel. The printer apprehensive of another edition. Other requests of the printer. *Page* 82–87.

CHAPTER XVI.

Anno 1537.

Many Suffragan Bishops made.

The feast of St. Thomas, &c. forbid. Robert Holgate consecrated bishop. John Bird, Lewis Thomas; some account of Bird; Thomas Morley, Richard Yngworth, John Thornton, Richard Thornden, John Hodgkin, Henry Holbeach; Suffragans.—*Page* 87–91.

CHAPTER XVII.

Anno 1538.

The Bible in English allowed.

The archbishop reads upon the Hebrews. A declaration for reading the Bible. The Bible received and read with great joy. The archbishop had a hand in Lambert's death. The bishops dispute against Lambert's reasons.—*Page* 91–95.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Anno 1538.

The Archbishop's Judgment of the Eucharist.

Cranmer zealous for the corporal presence. His reasons for it. Sanders, his slanders of the archbishop concerning his opinion in the sacrament. When Cranmer changed his opinion. Latimer of the same judgment. Divers priests marry wives. The king's proclamation against priests' marriages. Anabaptists. A commission against them. The waywardness of the priests occasions the king to write to the justices. The archbishop visits the diocese of Hereford. Bishops consecrated; William Finch, John Bradley.—*Page* 95–103.

CHAPTER XIX.

Anno 1538, 1539.

The Act of Six Articles.

The archbishop makes Nicholas Wotton commissary of his faculties. The king offended with the archbishop, and some other bishops. The six Articles opposed by the archbishop. The arguments the archbishop made use of at this time lost. The king's message to the archbishop by the lords. A book of ceremonies laboured to be brought in. A convocation. The Papists rejoice. Two priories surrendered to the archbishop. The archbishop and Crumwel labour with the king about the new bishoprics. Bishops this year ; John Bell, John Skyp.—*Page* 103–109.

CHAPTER XX.

Anno 1540.

The Archbishop in commission.

The archbishop's enemies accuse him. His honesty and courage in discharge of a commission : and his success therein. Questions of religion to be discussed by divines, by the king's command. The names of the commissioners. Seventeen questions upon the sacrament. The archbishop's judgment upon these questions. The judgments of other learned men concerning other points. An act to prevent divorces. The archbishop to Osiander, concerning the Germans' abuse of matrimony.—*Page* 109–116.

CHAPTER XXI.

Anno 1540.

The largest Bible printed.

Some account of printing the English Bible. The New Testament printed 1526. And burnt. Reprinted about 1530. Burnt again. The Scripture prohibited in a meeting at the Star-chamber. The

New Testament burnt the third time. The whole Bible printed 1537. Matthews', that is, Rogers's Bible. About 1538, the Bible printed again in Paris. The printers fall into the inquisition. The Bible printed with French presses in London. The largest Bible published in the year 1540. Bonner's admonition for reading the Bible. The Bible suppressed again, anno 1542–3. King Henry's judgment for the use of the Bible.—*Page* 117–124.

CHAPTER XXII.

Anno 1540.

The Archbishop retired.

The archbishop keeps himself more retired. The archbishop issues out his commission for the consecrating of Bonner. Bonner's oath of fidelity. The archbishop makes a commissary in Calais. Butler a better commissary. His troubles. The occasion thereof the discovery of a religious cheat. Glazier commissary in Calais. The archbishop's judgment of admission of scholars into the school belonging to the cathedral. Bishops consecrated: Edmund Bonner, Nicholas Hethe, Thomas Thirlby. Some account of Thirlby's rise.
Page 124–131.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Anno 1541.

All-Souls College visited.

The archbishop visits All-Souls College. Visits it a second time. The archbishop gives orders about shrines. The king to the archbishop for searching after shrines. The archbishop's orders accordingly to his dean, his archdeacon, and commissary. The archbishop lays Bekesburn to the see. Learned preachers preferred by the archbishop. The archbishop makes some recant. A convocation. Their business. Bishops consecrated: William Knight, John Wakeman, John Chambre, Arthur Bulkeley, Robert King.
Page 131–138.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Anno 1542.

The King's Book revised.

The king's book revised by the archbishop. Divers discourses of the archbishop. The goodly primer. The archbishop instrumental to the reformation of Scotland. An act procured by the archbishop. Paul Bush consecrated.—*Page* 138–144.

CHAPTER XXV.

Anno 1543.

Presentments at a Visitation.

The king's book published by authority. A visitation at Canterbury. Presentments. Reflections upon the former presentments. The prebendaries and preachers admonished by the archbishop. *Page* 144–157.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Anno 1543.

A black Cloud over the Archbishop.

The prebendaries plot against the archbishop. Winchester the chief manager. Winchester designs the death of divers of the court: and of the archbishop and his friends. The papers relating to Archbishop Cranmer's accusation. The contents thereof. The canons and preachers of Canterbury. Cranmer's chaplains complained of at the sessions. They prepare the articles, and prefer them. They add an article against the archbishop himself. London's practices. A great mass of articles against the archbishop procured. The chief instruments Gardiner, Serles, Shether. The bishop of Winchester's discourse with a prebendary of Canterbury. Willoughby and London wait at the council-chamber. Willoughby brought to the Lord Privy Seal, and to Winchester. The contents of the articles against the archbishop. More articles against his commissary. More still. The witnesses. The prebendaries deliver the articles. *Page* 157–169.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Anno 1543.

The King the Archbishop's Friend in this Danger.

The king himself discovers all to the archbishop. The archbishop desires a commission. The archbishop in commission expostulates with his accusers. Shether in prison sends to Winchester. Their reasons which they pretended for what they did. Cockes and Hussey commissioners, and his officers false. New commissioners sent down. The register false. The delinquents' chambers and chests searched. The treachery of Thornton and Barber. The archbishop's discourse to them. The conspirators are imprisoned. Their release. Their confessions and letters. The ends of the conspirators.—*Page* 170–177.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Anno 1543, 1544.

The Archbishop falls into more Troubles.

The archbishop accused before the parliament. The palace of Canterbury burnt. The Council accuse the archbishop. The king sends privately for him. Comes before the Council. The king rebukes the Council for Cranmer. The king changes the archbishop's arms. *Page* 177–182.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Anno 1544.

Occasional Prayers and Suffrages.

Prayers to be made against immoderate rain. English suffrages commanded to be used. The contents of the king's letter to that end. A procession for the king's expedition. The Council's letter to the archbishop. Popery prevails. Gardiner and the bishops now carry all. Bishop of Landaff removed to York. His oath. *Page* 182–190.

CHAPTER XXX.

Anno 1545, 1546.

The Archbishop reformeth the Canon Law.

The archbishop sets upon reforming the canon law. An act concerning it. The progress made by the archbishop in this work. The MS. of these laws. The archbishop labours in this work under King Edward. The archbishop employed in mending service-books. The king consults with the archbishop for the redress of certain superstitions. The opportunity of Winchester's absence taken. The archbishop prevails with the king in two great points. Seeks to redress alienation of the revenues of the cathedral. Scripture and sermons more common by the archbishop's means. Anthony Kitchen consecrated. A proclamation against the English Testament. He interprets a statute of his church. The archbishop, by the king's command, pens a form for a communion. His last office to the king.—*Page* 190–200.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

Anno 1546.

He crowns King Edward.

Conceives great hopes of King Edward. The archbishop takes a commission to execute his office. King Edward crowned by the archbishop. The manner of the coronation. The archbishop's speech at the coronation.—*Page* 201–207.

CHAPTER II.

Anno 1547.

A royal Visitation.

A royal visitation on foot. The visitors. The method of this visitation. The Homilies and Erasmus' Paraphrase.—*Page* 207–211.

CHAPTER III.

Anno 1547.

Homilies, and Erasmus' Paraphrase.

The archbishop writes to Winchester concerning the Homilies. The archbishop, &c. compose homilies. Winchester in the Fleet. The bishop of Winchester's censure of the homily of Salvation: and of the archbishop for it. Winchester's censure of Erasmus' Paraphrase. His account of his commitment. Erasmus vindicated. Winchester's letter to Somerset concerning these things. The archbishop appoints a thanksgiving for a victory. The archbishop to the bishop of London.—*Page* 211–220.

CHAPTER IV.

Anno 1547.

A Convocation.

A convocation in the first year of the king. Dr. Redman's judgment of priests' marriage. The archbishop's influence on the Parliament. The communion in both kinds established. The archbishop's queries concerning the mass. The archbishop assists at the funeral of the French king. The marquis of Northampton's divorce committed to the archbishop. Processions forbid by his means. Examines the offices of the Church.—*Page* 220–226.

CHAPTER V.

Anno 1547.

The Archbishop's Catechism.

The archbishop puts forth a Catechism. And a book against Unwritten Verities. His care of Canterbury.—*Page* 227–231.

CHAPTER VI.

Anno 1547.

The Archbishop's Care of the University.

The archbishop's influence upon the University. Some of St. John's College apply to him upon the apprehension of a danger. Offended with some of this college, and why. The ill condition and low estate of the university. An address of the university to the archbishop. The sum thereof. The success of the university's address to him and others. Another address to him against the townsmen. Roger Ascham's application to him for a dispensation for eating flesh. Favourably granted by the archbishop. The archbishop's opinion concerning Lent. Ascham acquaints him with the present state of the university, as to their studies. Sir John Cheke, the archbishop's dear friend, the prime instrument of politer studies there. The impediments of the university's flourishing state laid before him. *Page* 232-244.

CHAPTER VII.

Anno 1547.

Dr. Smith and others recant.

Dr. Smith recants at Paul's Cross. His books. Gardiner offended with this recantation. Other university-men recant. Smith affronts the archbishop. His inconstancy. The archbishop's admonition to the vicar of Stepney. The archbishop licenseth an eminent preacher. Who preacheth against the errors and superstitions of the church. Is bound to answer for his sermon at the assizes. How far the Reformation had proceeded. Ridley consecrated bishop. *Page* 244–252.

CHAPTER VIII.

Anno 1548.

The Church's Goods embezzled. New opinions broached.

Churches profaned. Church ornaments embezzled. The Council's letter to the archbishop thereupon. A form of prayer sent to the archbishop; with the Council's letter. New opinions broached.

Champneys revokes six articles; and abjures. Other heresies vented. Asheton's recantation. Other errors still. Joan Bocher's heresy. Latimer's censure of her. George van Paris.—*Page* 252–261.

CHAPTER IX.

Anno 1548.

The Archbishop visits.

The archbishop visits his diocese. His articles for the clergy, and for the laity. An exchange made between the archbishop and the Lord Windsor. Farrar, bishop of St. David's, consecrated. Some account of this bishop. The archbishop swayed by Farrar's enemies.
Page 262–267.

CHAPTER X.

Anno 1549.

The Archbishop answers the Rebels' Articles.

Rebellion in Devon. The archbishop answers the rebels' articles. Some account thereof. Crispin, Moreman, Cardinal Pole. The archbishop procures sermons to be made against the rebellion. Peter Martyr's sermon upon this occasion. The French take occasion at this rebellion. Bucer's discourse against the sedition. The archbishop's prayer, composed for this occasion.—*Page* 267–272.

CHAPTER XI.

Anno 1549.

Bishop Bonner deprived.

The archbishop deprives Bonner. Discourse between the archbishop and him concerning his book; and concerning the sacrament. Chargeth the archbishop concerning the preachers he allowed. The archbishop's answer to Bonner's declaration. Papists insist upon the invalidity of the laws made in the king's minority. An ordination of priests and deacons. The office of ordination reformed. The archbishop visits some vacant churches ; St. David's, Gloucester, Norwich, London. A new dean of the Arches.—*Page* 272–277.

CHAPTER XII.

Anno 1549.

Duke of Somerset's Troubles. The Common Prayer ratified.

The archbishop writes to the lords at Ely-house. Their answer. The archbishop gets the Common Prayer-Book confirmed. *Page* 277–280.

CHAPTER XIII.

Anno 1549.

The Archbishop entertains learned Foreigners.

The archbishop harbours learned strangers. Bucer writes in the archbishop's family. The archbishop's guests. Martyr dedicates his Lectures at Oxon to the archbishop. The archbishop writes to Bucer to come over. Bucer and Fagius professors at Cambridge. Fagius dies. The archbishop sends money to Fagius's widow. Bucer laments his loss.—*Page* 280–286.

CHAPTER XIV.

Anno 1549.

Peter Martyr disputes in Oxford, being challenged thereunto.

Peter Martyr challenged publicly to a disputation. His answer hereunto. Declines it at present ; and why. They agree upon the conditions of a disputation. They dispute. Martyr sends the sum of

the disputation to the archbishop. The disputation published by Martyr: and by Tresham. Smith writes to the archbishop from Scotland. Disputations at Cambridge before the commissioners. Bucer disputes. His judgment of the Sacrament.—*Page* 286–293.

CHAPTER XV.

Anno 1549.

Matters of the Church, and its State now.

Relics of Popery remaining. The Council gives orders to the justices; and writes to the bishops. Neglect in London. Adulteries frequent. Books dispersed by Protestants. Preaching against Lent. Gardiner's judgment of a rhyme against Lent. Latimer counsels the king about marriage. Foreign Protestants, their offer to King Edward.—*Page* 294–300.

CHAPTER XVI.

Anno 1550.

Ridley made Bishop of London. The Communion-Book reviewed.

Ridley made bishop of London. Rochester vacant. Bucer writes to Dorset not to spoil the church. The Common Prayer-Book reviewed. Bucer and Martyr employed in it.—*Page* 300–304.

CHAPTER XVII.

Anno 1550.

Hooper's Troubles.

Hooper nominated for bishop of Gloucester. He and Ridley confer about the habits. The archbishop writes to Bucer for his judgment in this matter. The questions. Martyr writes to Hooper. Hooper's two objections considered. Another objection of Hooper considered. Other things urged by him. Hooper confined to his house, and silenced. Committed to the archbishop's custody. Sent to the Fleet. Hooper conforms. Martyr to Gualtier concerning Hooper's conformity.—*Page* 305–312.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Anno 1550.

Bishop Hooper visits his Diocese.

Hooper visits his diocese. His articles of religion. His injunctions and interrogatories. Holds Worcester *in commendam;* and visits that church and see. Goes over both his dioceses again. The Council's order concerning the two canons. License for the bishop of Gloucester to attend upon the duchess of Somerset in the Tower. Other matters relating to this bishop.—*Page* 312–317.

CHAPTER XIX.

Anno 1550

Troubles of Bishop Gardiner.

Divers great lords repair to Gardiner. The Council's proceedings with him. Articles propounded to him to subscribe. Winchester sequestered for three months. The sequestration expires. The commissioners sit to examine him. A letter of some noblemen, whom he had belied. Gardiner offers his book against Cranmer to the commissioners. He is deprived. The Council's order for his strait confinement. Poinet made bishop of Winton.—*Page* 317–326.

CHAPTER XX.

Anno 1550.

Bishop Heath and Bishop Day, their Deprivations.

Other Popish bishops dealt with. Bishop Heath's troubles. Sent for before the Council. Day, bishop of Chichester, his troubles. Bishop Day will not pull down altars. Appears before the Council. The archbishop and bishop of Ely reason with him. The Council give him time to confer. Before the Council again. Before the Council the third time. And the fourth time, when he was sent to the Fleet. Commissioners appointed for Worcester and Chichester. They are deprived. Placed, the one with the lord chancellor, and the other with the bishop of London. Day writes to King's College for leaving off masses. His unnatural carriage towards his brother. Preaches against Transubstantiation. His change charged on him. *Page* 326–335.

CHAPTER XXI.

Anno 1550.

Papists grow bold. Loose Professors restrained.

The Papists write libels. Several Papists now taken up. Chedsey, Morgan, Sir Anthony Brown, White. Other professors restrained. *Page* 335–338.

CHAPTER XXII.

Anno 1550.

Foreigners allowed Churches. A Lasco.

The archbishop's care of the souls of strangers residing here. The Dutch congregation under John à Lasco. The occasion of his coming into England. His business here. From Embden he wrote to the archbishop; and to Cecil. The sad condition of the Protestants there. Latimer mentions à Lasco to the king. Contest among à Lasco's people. The care of à Lasco over his church, and its privileges. Favourably received by the Lord Chancellor Goodrich. Labours with the secretary to procure letters from the Council in behalf of his church. The extent of his superintendency. Melancthon thought to shelter himself under him. His great abilities for government. Erasmus's praise of him. Purchased Erasmus's library. A Lasco a married man. His influence in the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth. Blamed for meddling in our controversies. A church of Italians constituted in London. Michael Angelo their minister. The service the archbishop did for this church; and for the minister. Divers of this church fall out with their minister, and go to mass again. A conjecture at the cause thereof. Their minister sends their names to the secretary, and accuses them. The morals of this man tainted. Writes a penitent letter to the secretary. A French church also in London.—*Page* 338–348.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Anno 1550.

The Church at Glastonbury.

Another church of strangers at Glastonbury. Their trade weaving. Valerandus Pollanus, their preacher and superintendent. How they came to fix here. Conditions of trade between them and Somerset. Their trade obstructed by the troubles of Somerset. Apply themselves again to the council, and to the Secretary Cecil. The Council become their patrons, and assist them. Orders from the lords to set this manufacture forwards. Pollanus very serviceable to them. An apology for the largeness of the former relation. After the king's death they remove to Frankfort. Prove friends to the English exiles there. A Spanish church. Cassiodorus and Corranus their preachers. Many of King Philip's Spaniards become Protestants. Great numbers of Protestants in Spain and Italy.
Page 349–356.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Anno 1550.

The Archbishop's Care of the Revenues of the Church. Bucer dies.

The archbishop labours to preserve the revenues of the Church. The detaining the church revenues a scandal to the Reformation. Calvin to the archbishop upon this matter; and to the duke of Somerset. Bucer publicly disputeth at Cambridge. Dieth. The University wrote up concerning his death. Bucer's library. His widow retires to Germany. The correspondence between him and Martyr. A plot of the Papists at Oxon against Martyr, at an act. Martyr's judgment of the Communion-Book. Bucer's great dangers. Poinet consecrated, and Hooper.—*Page* 356–366.

CHAPTER XXV.

Anno 1551.

The Archbishop publisheth his book against Gardiner.

Cranmer publisheth his book of the Sacrament. His first book of that subject. Wrote against by Gardiner and Smith. Vindicated in another book by the archbishop. The method of the archbishop's reply. The judgments made of this book. How the archbishop came off from the opinion of the corporeal presence. The archbishop's great skill in controversy. Peter Martyr enlightened by Cranmer. Fox's conjecture of the archbishop. A second book of Gardiner against the archbishop. The archbishop begins a third book. Martyr takes up the quarrel. Cranmer puts out his book of the Sacrament in Latin. Printed again at Embden. Cranmer's second book intended to be put into Latin. Some notes of Cranmer concerning the Sacrament. Martyr succeeds Cranmer in this province. Writes against Gardiner and Smith.—*Page* 366–381.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Anno 1551.

The Duke of Somerset's Death.

The duke of Somerset's death. Winchester supposed to be in the plot. Articles against the duke. What he is blamed for. The new Book of Common Prayer established. Coverdale made bishop of Exon. Scory bishop elect of Rochester. The archbishop appoints a guardian of the spiritualities of Lincoln; and of Wigorn; and of Chichester; and of Hereferd; and of Bangor. Hooper visits his diocese. Two disputations concerning the Sacrament. Dr. Redman dies. The archbishop and others appointed to reform ecclesiastical laws. The method they observed. Scory, Coverdale, consecrated.—*Page* 381–392.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Anno 1552.

The Articles of Religion.

The Articles of Religion framed and published. The archbishop's diligence in them. The archbishop retires to Ford.—*Page* 392–395.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Anno 1552.

Persons nominated for Irish Bishoprics.

Consulted with for fit persons to fill the Irish sees. Some account of the four divines nominated by him for the archbishopric of Armagh. Mr. Whitehead; Mr. Turner; Thomas Rosse, or Rose; Robert Wisdome. The character the archbishop gave of the two former. Turner designed for Armagh; but declines it. Goodacre made archbishop of Armagh. Letters from the Council to Ireland, recommending the Irish bishops.—*Page* 395–404.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Anno 1552.

The Archbishop charged with covetousness.

A rumour given out of the archbishop's covetousness and wealth; which Cecil sends him word of. The archbishop's answer for himself and the other bishops. This very slander raised upon him to King Henry. King Henry promised him lands. This promise performed by King Edward. His purchases. The archbishopric fleeced by King Henry. Lands passed away to the Crown by exchange. Lands made over to the archbishop. The archbishop parted also with Knol and Otford to the king. What moved him to make these exchanges. His cares and fears for the king.—*Page* 404–410.

CHAPTER XXX.

Anno 1552.

His Care for the Vacancies. Falls sick.

His care for filling the vacancies of the Church. Laboured under an ague this autumn. The great mortality of agues about this time. That which most concerned him in his sickness. The secretary sends the archbishop the copy of the emperor's pacification.—*Page* 410–412.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Anno 1552.

His kindness for Germany.

His kindness for Germany. His correspondence with Germany; and with Herman, archbishop of Cologne. The suitableness of both these archbishops' dispositions. Their diligence in reforming. *Page* 413–416.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Anno 1552.

Troubles of Bishop Tonstal.

The troubles of Bishop Tonstal. The causes of this bishop's punishment. A bill in parliament to attaint Tonstal. The care of the diocese committed to the dean.—*Page* 416–418.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Anno 1552.

The new Common Prayer. The Archbishop in Kent.

The new Common Prayer began to be used. This book put into French for the king's French subjects. The age still vicious. A new sect in Kent. The archbishop's business in Kent. A letter for installing Bishop Hooper. The vicar of Beden. Sampson and Knox. The Council favour Knox. John Taylor consecrated.—*Page* 418–423.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Anno 1553.

A Catechism. The Archbishop opposeth the exclusion of the Lady Mary.

Great use made of the archbishop at council. The Articles of Religion enjoined by the king's authority. The Catechism for schools. A

Catechism set forth by the Synod. The archbishop opposeth the new settlement of the crown. Denieth before the Council to subscribe to the exclusion of the Lady Mary. Sets his hand. The archbishop ungratefully dealt with. The Council subscribe and swear to the limited succession.—*Page* 424–429.

CHAPTER XXXV.

Anno 1553.

The King dies.

The king dies. His character. The archbishop delights in this prince's proficiency. King Edward's writings. The king's memorial for religion. The archbishop frequent at council. His presence in the Council in the year 1550. In the year 1551. In the year 1552. And 1553. John Harley consecrated bishop.—*Page* 429–436.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

MEMORIALS

OF

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

Cranmer's Birth, Education, and Rise.

THE name of this most reverend prelate deserves to stand upon eternal record; having been the first Protestant archbishop of this kingdom, and the greatest instrument, under God, of the happy Reformation of this Church of England: in whose piety, learning, wisdom, conduct, and blood, the foundation of it was laid. And therefore it will be no unworthy work to revive his memory now, though after an hundred and thirty years and upwards. I pretend not to write a complete narrative of his life and death, that being scarce possible at such a distance of time, and in the want of full intelligence and information of the various matters that passed through his hands, and the events that befell him. All that I attempt by this present undertaking is, to retrieve and bring to light as many historical passages as I can, concerning this holy prelate; by a careful and long search, not only into printed books of history, but the best archives, and many most precious and inestimable manuscripts that have fallen into my hands.

I shall pass over, in a few words, his earlier days, because I have so much to say of him in his riper years. Aslacton, a town in the county of Nottingham, was the place of his birth; and the second day of July, in the year 1489, was the day of it. He was the son of Thomas Cranmer, Esq., a gentleman of a right ancient family, whose ancestor came in with the Conqueror; and for a long series of time the stock continued in good wealth and quality, as it did in France, for there were extant of his name and family there, in the reign of Henry the Eighth. One whereof came then into England, in company with the French ambassador, to whom, for relation sake, our bishop gave a noble entertainment.

Our youth was put to learn his grammar of a rude parish-clerk in that barbarous age, under whom he learned little, and endured much from the harsh and curst disposition of his schoolmaster. Though his father were minded to have his son educated in learning, yet he would not he should be ignorant of civil and gentleman-like exercises, insomuch that he used himself to shoot. And many times his father permitted him to hunt and hawk, and to ride rough horses; so that when he was bishop, he feared not to ride the roughest horses that came into his stables, which he would do very comely. As otherwise at all times there was not any in his house that would become an horse better. And after his studies, when it was time for recreation, he would both hawk and hunt, the game being prepared for him. And sometimes he would shoot in the long-bow, and many times kill the deer with his cross-bow, though his sight was not perfect, for he was purblind.[1]

But to return to his younger days. He lost his father early; but his mother, at the age of fourteen years, anno 1503, sent him to study at Cambridge, where he was nursled in the grossest kind of sophistry, logic, philosophy, moral and natural: not in the text of the old philosophers, but chiefly in the dark riddles of Duns, and other subtile questionists.[2] And in these he lost his time, till he came to two and twenty years of age. After that, he gave himself to the reading of Faber, Erasmus, good Latin authors, four or five years together, unto the time that Luther began to write.[3] And then, considering what great controversy was in matters of religion, not only in trifles, but in the chiefest articles of our salvation, he bent himself to try out the truth herein.

And forasmuch as he perceived he could not judge indifferently in such weighty matters, without the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; therefore, before he was infected with any man's opinions or errors, he applied his whole study three years therein.[1] After this, he gave his mind to good writers, both new and old; not rashly running over them, for he was a slow reader, but a diligent marker of whatsoever he read, seldom reading without pen in hand. And whatsoever made either for the one part or the other, of things in controversy, he wrote it out, if it were short, or at least noted the author, and the place, that he might find it, and write it out at leisure, which was a great help to him in debating of matters ever after.

---

[1] Life of Cranmer, in the MSS. C.C.C.C.

[2] Life of Cranmer, inter Foxii MSS.

[3] [From] anno 1511 [to] anno 1516.

This kind of study he used till he was made doctor of divinity, which was about the thirty-fourth year of his age, and about the year 1523.

But before this, being master of arts, and fellow of Jesus College, he married a gentleman's daughter. And then leaving the college, he read the common lecture in Buckingham College, before that called Monk's College, because monks studied there, but now Magdalen College. But in a year after, his wife travailing with child, both she and the child died. And being now single again, immediately the master and fellows of his old college chose him in fellow again, where he remained.

During his residence here, divers of the ripest and solidest sort of scholars were sought out of this university of Cambridge, to be transplanted into Cardinal Wolsey's new college in Oxon, to be fellows there. Our Cranmer was nominated for one by Dr. Capon, to whom that matter was, as it seems, intrusted by the Cardinal. And though the salary was much more considerable there, and the way to preferment more ready, by the favour of the Cardinal, to such as were his own scholars; yet he refused to go, choosing rather to abide among his old fellow-collegians, and more closely to follow his studies and contemplations here; though he were not without danger for his incompliance with this invitation, giving them that were concerned great offence hereat. But of those that went from Cambridge at this time, who were all men picked out for their parts and learning, these were the chief: Clark; Friar, afterwards doctor of physic; Sumner; Harman, afterwards fellow of Eaton; Betts, afterwards chaplain to Queen Ann; Cox, afterwards schoolmaster to King Edward; Frith, afterwards a martyr; Baily, Godman; Drum, afterwards one of the six preachers at Canterbury; Lawney, afterwards chaplain to the duke of Norfolk. All these were cast into prison for suspicion of heresy; and divers through the hardship thereof died. So that well it was for Cranmer that he went not.

---

[1] Anno 1519.

Soon after, he took his degree of doctor of divinity, and became the reader of the divinity-lecture in his own college. And out of the value the university had of his learning, he was appointed one of the examiners of such as commenced bachelors and doctors in divinity, according to whose approbations, the university allowed them to proceed; in which place he did much good, for he used to examine these candidates out of the Scriptures; and by no means would let them pass, if he found they were unskilful in it, and unacquainted with the history of the Bible. So were the friars especially, whose study lay only in school authors; whom therefore he sometimes turned back as insufficient, advising them to study the Scriptures for some years longer, before they came for their degrees; it being a shame for a professor in divinity to be unskilled in the book, wherein the knowledge of God and the grounds of divinity lay. Whereby he made himself from the beginning hated by the friars; yet some of the more ingenuous sort of them afterward rendered him great and public thanks for refusing them; whereby, being put upon the study of God's word, they attained to more sound knowledge in religion. One of these was Dr. Barat, a white friar, who lived afterwards in Norwich.

Not long after this, King Henry being persuaded that the marriage between him and Queen Katharine, daughter to King Ferdinand of Spain, was unlawful and naught, by Dr. Longland, bishop of Lincoln, his confessor, and other of his clergy; he sent to six of the best learned men of Cambridge, and as many of Oxford, to debate this question, *Whether it were lawful for one brother to marry his brother's wife, being known of his brother!* Of the which Cambridge doctors, Cranmer was appointed for one; such was his fame then in that university for learning. But because he was not then at Cambridge, another was chosen in his stead. These learned men agreed fully, with one consent, that it was lawful, with the pope's dispensation, so to do. But if Cranmer had been there, he would have been of another mind, as we shall see in the sequel.

This great matrimonial cause gave the first step to Dr. Cranmer's preferment: for when Fox and Gardiner, the one the king's almoner, and the other his secretary, lighting by chance in Dr. Cranmer's company, at one Mr. Cressie's house, situate in Waltham Abbey parish, in Essex, had on design fallen upon discourse of that matter, purposely to learn his judgment therein, knowing him an eminent noted reader of divinity in Cambridge, he gave his own sense of the cause, in words to this effect:—"I have nothing at all studied," said he, "for the verity of this cause; nor am beaten therein, as you have been. Howbeit, I do think that you go not the next way to work, to bring the matter unto a perfect conclusion and end, especially for the satisfaction of the troubled conscience of the king's highness. For in observing the common process, and frustratory delays of these your courts, the matter will linger long enough; and peradventure in the end come to small effect. And this is most certain," said he, "there is but one truth in it; which no men ought, or better can discuss than the divines, whose sentence may be soon known, and brought so to pass with little industry and charges, that the king's conscience may thereby be quieted and pacified; which we all ought to consider and regard in this question or doubt; and then his highness, in conscience quieted, may determine himself that which shall seem good before God. And let these tumultuary processes give place unto a certain truth."[1]

His opinion, thus unwillingly drawn from him, was so much liked of by them to whom he spake it, that they thought it worth their acquainting the king with it; which they did within two days after at Greenwich. Whereupon the king commanded he should be sent for to the court, which was done, and he brought into the king's presence, who, having heard him discourse upon the marriage, and well observing the gravity and modesty, as well as learning of the man, resolved to cherish and make much of him. This

[1] Life of Cranmer, in the MSS. C.C.C.C.

was about August, 1529, the king having commanded him to digest in writing what he could say upon the foresaid argument, retained him, and committed him unto the family and care of the earl of Wiltshire and Ormond, named Sir Thomas Bolen, dwelling then at Durham House; esteeming him a fit person for Cranmer to reside with, who had himself been employed in embassies to Rome and Germany about the same matter, and so able to instruct our divine in particular passages relating thereunto; and likewise would be sure to afford him all the security, and favour, and aid possible, from the prospect, that if the king's former marriage could be proved unlawful, and thereby null and void, his own family would be in a fair probability to be highly advanced, by the king's matching with his daughter, the Lady Ann Bolen.

Nor was Cranmer unsuitably placed here, in regard of the disposition of his noble host; being accounted one of the learnedest noblemen in the land, and endued with a mind inclined to philosophy. Erasmus, who had good intelligence in England, and knew this earl himself, gives this account of him to Damianus à Goes:—"Est enim vir, ut uno ore prædicant omnes, unus prope inter nobiles eruditus, animoque plane philosophico."[1] He was also much addicted to the study and love of the holy Scriptures, as the same Erasmus in an epistle to him mentioneth, and commendeth him for:—"I do the more congratulate your happiness, when I observe the sacred Scriptures to be so dear to a man, as you are, of power, one of the laity, and a courtier; and that you have such a desire to that pearl of price."[2] He was also a patron of learning and learned men: and if there were nothing else to testify this, it would be enough to say, that he was well affected to the great Erasmus, and a true valuer of his studies. The world is beholden to this noble peer for some of the labours that proceeded from the pen of that most learned man. For upon his desire Erasmus wrote three tracts; one was, Enarrations upon the twenty-second Psalm, intituled, *Dominus regit me;* but more truly the twenty-third. Another was, an Explication of the Apostle's Creed. And the third, Directions how to Prepare for Death. And from these subjects, which this nobleman chose to desire Erasmus, thoughts of, we may conclude also his pious and religious mind. All which his virtuous accomplishments, as they rendered his house a suitable harbour for the learned and pious Cranmer, so they were not a little increased by his converse and familiarity there.

---

[1] Epist. 19, lib. 27.

[2] "Impensius gratulor tuæ fælicitati, quod homini potenti, laico, et aulico, perspiciam etiam sacras literas esse cordi, teque nobilis illius margaritæ desiderio teneri."—Epist. 34, lib. 29.

For while Cranmer abode here, a great friendship was contracted between him and that noble family; especially the chief members of it, the countess and the Lady Ann, and the earl himself; who often held serious conferences with him about the great matter. And in the earl's absence from home, letters passed between them; Cranmer writing to him of the affairs of the court, and of the welfare of his family, as well as of other more weighty things. In one letter, dated from Hampton Court, in the month of June (which by circumstance must be in the year 1530), he writ to him, "That the king's grace, my lady his wife, my Lady Ann his daughter, were in good health; and that the king and my Lady Ann, rode the day before to Windsor from Hampton Court, and that night they were looked for again there; praying God to be their guide."

And I cannot look upon this pious and learned man's placing here in this family, but as guided by a peculiar hand of divine providence. Whereby this house became better acquainted with the knowledge of the Gospel; and had the seeds of true religion scattered in the hearts of those noble persons that were related to it; particularly of her who was afterwards to be advanced to that high and public station, to be consort to the king. And that she became a favourer, and, as much as she durst, a promoter of the purer religion, must, I think, in a great measure be owing thereunto.

When Cranmer had accomplished the king's request, and finished his book, he himself, the secretary, and the almoner, and other learned men, had in commission to dispute the cause in question in both the universities. Which being first attempted at Cambridge, Dr. Cranmer, by his authority, learning, and persuasion,[1] brought over divers learned men in one day, of the contrary part and opinion, to be on his part. For being now, after some absence, returned to Cambridge, divers of the university, and some of those doctors that before had given in their judgments to the king for the validity of the Pope's dispensation, repaired to him, to know his opinion; and, after long reasoning, he changed the minds of five of the six. Then almost in every disputation, both in private houses and in the common schools, this was one question, *Whether the Pope might dispense with the brother to marry the brother's wife, after carnal knowledge?* And it was of many openly defended, that he might not. The secretary, when he came home, acquainted the king with what they had done, and how Dr. Cranmer had changed the minds of five of the said learned men of Cambridge, and of many others beside. Afterward this university, as well as the other, determined the king's cause against the Pope's dispensation.

---

[1] MS. Life of Cranmer.

From an academic, our doctor being now become a courtier, he so prudently demeaned himself, that he was not only dear to the earl of Wiltshire's family, but grew much favoured by the nobility in general; as the Lord Herbert collects from the historians of those times, and especially by the king himself.[1] He was very much about him, the king holding frequent communication with him, and seemed unwilling to have him absent. Which may appear from hence, that when Cranmer was minded for some reason to resort to the earl of Wiltshire, who was then from Hampton Court, and as it seems at London, upon some occasions of his own, he doubted whether the king would let him go. And so he writ to him, that he would come the next day to him, *if the king's grace let him not.*

CHAPTER II.

Pole's Book about the King's Matrimony.

About this time a book of Reginald Pole, afterwards Cardinal, earnestly persuading the king to continue his marriage with his queen, fell into Dr. Cranmer's hands. I do not find mention of this book in any historian, that hath come to my hands. No, not in his life published by Bacatellus, bishop of Ragusa, though he hath there given us a catalogue of his books. But in likelihood the reason was, because this was some private discourse, or letter, chiefly intended for the king's own use, as appears from some words of Cranmer concerning it, viz.—"That it was writ with that eloquence, that if it were set forth, and known to the common people [an evidence it was a more private writing], it were not possible to persuade them to the contrary." It was penned about the year 1530, as may be collected from another passage in the said writing, wherein he mentioneth the king's living in wedlock with Queen Katharine twenty years, the expiration of which fell in about that time. What induced Pole to write on this subject is to me uncertain; for he avoided, as much as could be, to meddle in this affair, out of fear of the king's displeasure, which was the reason of his departing abroad. Probably it was at the king's command; like as some years after he commanded him to write his judgment of the title of *Supreme Head*, which he had lately assumed. Which occasioned Pole's four books of Ecclesiastical Unity. For some about the king had told him, it would have a great influence upon the people, especially the nobility, if he could bring Pole over to allow and approve of his marriage: who was a person, though then but young, yet highly valued in the nation for his piety, and learning, and great descent.

---

[1] Life of Henry VIII. p. 375.

The book was soon delivered, whether by the earl of Wiltshire or the king himself, unto the examination and consideration of Cranmer, now the great court divine; who, after he had greedily perused it, sent the contents of it in a letter to his friend and patron the earl, being then absent from court. The book, though the argument of it chiefly depended upon divinity, proceeded more on political principles than divine. Take the following account of it, as Cranmer gave it in his said letter.

First, Pole treated of the danger of diversity of titles to the crown; which might follow, if the present marriage with Queen Katharine were rejected (in which there was an heir), and another consummated; as appeared by the titles and pretensions of the two houses of Lancaster and

York. And that the king ought to provide against the miseries that might be brought upon his realm by the people, if he should reject his daughter, whom they took for his lawful heir, and should persuade them to take another. Then he urged the danger of incurring the emperor's displeasure, the queen being his aunt, and the princess his cousin. Then he proceeded to consider the reasons that moved the king to his present resolutions; namely, that God's law forbad marrying the brother's wife: and that the people, however averse at first (besides that it belonged not to them to judge of such matters), would be content in the king's doings, when they should know how the ancient doctors of the church and so many great universities were on the king's side. And that however the emperor might fall out with the king for this matter, yet God would never fail those that stood on his part, and refused to transgress his commandments: and that England might depend on the French king's aid, by virtue of the league which he had entered into with the king, and the old grudge which he bore towards the emperor. Afterwards, Pole goes on to review these reasons. And first, his judgment was, that Scripture might be brought to justify this marriage, and that there was as good ground of Scripture for that, as for the part which the king then took, namely, the unlawfulness of it. That if indeed he thought the king's part was just, and that his marriage were undoubtedly against God's pleasure, then he could not deny, but that it should be well done for the king to refuse it, and take another wife. Yet he confessed that, for his own part, he could not find in his heart to have any hand, or be any furtherer or abettor in it; acknowledging, however, that he had no good reason for it, but only out of affection and duty to the king's person: because he would not disannul the princess his daughter's title, nor accuse the most part of the king's life, as the books written on the king's part did; as though he had lived in a matrimony shameful, abominable, bestial, and against nature. This seemed an high compliment of Pole's indeed, that he would rather choose to let the king live and die in an habitual breach of God's law, than be guilty of something that might argue a want of civil affection and duty in him.

And as concerning the people, his judgment was, that neither by learning, nor preaching, would they ever be brought into an ill conceit of the king's former marriage, and to think so dishonourably of their king, as to live so many years in matrimony so abominable. But as they had begun to hate priests, this would make them much more to do so; nay, and the very name of learning too. As for the authority of the universities, they were many times led by affection, which was well known: and he wished they had never erred in their determinations. He showed, that they were brought to the king's part with great difficulty. Moreover, against the universities' authority, he set the authority of the king's father and his council, the queen's father and his council, and the Pope and his.

Then he proceeded to political considerations of the Pope, and emperor, and the French king. That the Pope was a great adversary of the king's purpose, he had showed divers tokens already; and that not without cause. Because if he should consent, he should do against his predecessors, and restrain his own power, which he would rather gladly enlarge, and likewise raise seditions in many realms, as in Portugal; of whose king the emperor married one sister, and the duke of Savoy the other. Then he went on extolling the emperor's power, and lessening that of the French king, as to his aiding of us: mentioning the mischief the emperor might do England, by forbidding only our trading into Flanders and Spain. That the French never used to keep their leagues with us, but for their own ends, and that we could never find in our hearts to trust them; and that the two nations never loved one another. And that if the French should but suspect that this new matrimony (of the king with the Lady Ann Bolen, now proposed), should not continue, we must not expect succour of them, but upon intolerable conditions. And then lastly, he comes to deliberate for the saving the king's honour; which as it was impossible to do, if he proceeded one step further, for he had already, he said, gone to the very brink—so he began to propound certain means for the rescue of it. Thus far is Cranmer's relation of the book.

But here he breaks off, the messenger that tarried for the letter being in haste; promising the next day to come to the earl, to whom he wrote all this, and relate the rest to him by word of mouth. These means, in short, were (as I collect from some other passages of this letter), to refer the matter wholly to the Pope, and to reject the thoughts of matching with the Lady Ann; the which was now much talked of; for the king and she were very great, and about this very time they both rode together from Hampton Court to Windsor; though she were yet no more than the Lady Ann, without any other title.

The censure which our divine gave of this book, and the writer, was this (wherein his modesty and candour, as well as judgment, appeared): "that Pole had showed himself both witty and eloquent; and that, for his wisdom, he might have been of counsel to the king: and such his rhetoric, that if his book should have been set forth, and known to the common people, he believed it were not possible to persuade them to the contrary." Concerning that which he chiefly drove at, namely, that the king should commit his great matter to the Pope's judgment, Cranmer gave his opinion, "that he seemed therein to lack much judgment; and that though he pressed it with such goodly eloquence, both of words and sentence, that he were likely to persuade many; yet him," he said, "he persuaded in that point nothing at all." No, Cranmer had too well studied the point, to leave such a case of conscience to the Pope's decision. But in many other things in this discourse of Pole, he professed he was much satisfied. I have placed this whole letter in the Appendix at the end of these Memorials,[1] as I shall do many other letters and papers of value, partly for the satisfaction of more curious readers, that love to see originals, and partly for the preservation of many choice monuments relating to this man and these times, and for the transferring them to posterity.

---

[1] Num. 1.

CHAPTER III.

Cranmer's Embassies.

In the year 1530, Dr. Cranmer was sent by the king into France, Italy, and Germany, with the earl of Wiltshire, chief ambassador; Dr. Lee, elect archbishop of York; Dr. Stokesly, elect of London, divines; Trigonel, Karn, and Benet, doctors of the law; to dispute these matrimonial matters of his majesty at Paris, Rome, and other places, carrying the book he had made upon that subject with him. From France they took their journey to the Pope, where Cranmer's book was delivered to him, and he ready to justify it, and to offer a dispute against the marriage openly, upon these two points, which his book chiefly consisted of, viz.:—

I. That no man, *jure divino*, could, or ought to marry his brother's wife.

II. That the bishop of Rome by no means ought to dispense to the contrary.

But after sundry promises and appointments made, there was no man found to oppose him, and publicly to dispute these matters with him. Yet in more private argumentations with them that were about the Pope, he so forced them, that at last they openly granted, even in the Pope's chief court of the Rota, that the said marriage was against God's law. But as for the Pope's power of dispensing with the laws of God, it was too advantageous a tenet to be parted with. But Dr. Cranmer boldly and honestly denied it utterly before them all.

The king's ambassadors from the Pope repaired to the Emperor Charles V., Cranmer only being left behind at Rome, to make good his challenge, and withal, more privately to get the judgments and subscriptions of the learned men there in the king's case, which was one of his businesses also in Germany after. What he did in this latter affair, he signified by a letter to Crook, another of the king's agents, for that purpose in Italy; namely, "That his success there at Rome was but little; and that they dared not to attempt to know any man's mind, because of the Pope, who had said that friars should not discuss his power. And added, that he looked for little favour in that court, but to have the Pope and all his cardinals declare against them."[1]

Here at Rome Cranmer abode for some months. But in all the journey he behaved himself so learnedly, soberly, and wittily, that the earl of Wilts gave him such commendations to the king by his letters, that the rest coming home, he sent him a commission, with instructions to be his sole ambassador to the emperor in his said great cause.[2] Which commissional letters of the king to him, bare date January 24, 1531, wherein he was styled *Consiliarius Regius et ad Cæsarem Orator*.[3] By this opportunity of travelling through Germany, following the emperor's court, by his conferences he fully satisfied many learned Germans, which afore were of a contrary judgment; and divers in the emperor's own court and council also. One of the chiefest of these, and who suffered severely for it, was Cornelius Agrippa, knight, doctor of both laws, judge of the Prerogative Court, and counseller to the emperor, and a man of deep learning, who confessed to the said ambassador, that the marriage was naught, but that he durst not say so openly, for fear both of the Pope and emperor. Yet he was afterwards cast into prison, where he died, for expressing his mind, as was thought, somewhat more plainly in this affair.

While he was now abroad in Germany, he went to Nuremberg, where Osiander was pastor. And being a man of fame and learning, our ambassador became acquainted with him, sending for him sometimes to discourse with him, and sometimes he would go to Osiander's house, to visit him and his study. This eminent divine of the German Protestant Church he also gained to favour the king's cause. For he wrote a book of incestuous marriages, wherein he determined the king's present matrimony to be unlawful. But this book was called in by a prohibition, printed at Augsburgh. And there was also a form of a direction, drawn up by the same Osiander, how the king's process should be managed, which was sent over hither. Cranmer's discourse with Osiander, at these their meetings, concerning divers matters relating especially to Christian doctrine, and true religion, were so wise and good, that that great divine stood in admiration of him, as though he had been inspired from above.[1] In one of their conferences, Osiander communicated to him certain papers, wherein he had been attempting to harmonize the Gospels, but, by reason of the difficulties that often arose, had thrown them aside. A thing this was which Cranmer declared to him his great approbation of; as he was always a man greatly studious of the Scripture, and earnestly desirous that the right knowledge thereof might be increased. So he vehemently exhorted him to go forward in this study, and to finish it with all convenient speed; for that it would not only, he said, be of use to the church of Christ, but adorn it. These admonitions gave new strength to Osiander to fall afresh about this work, and at last to bring it to a conclusion. In the year 1537 he published it, and dedicated it to Cranmer, then archbishop, the great encourager of the author.

---

[1] [Burnet's] Hist. Refor. part i. p. 89 [vol. i. p. 180].

[2] Life of Cranmer, inter Foxii MSS.

[3] Hist. Luther. per Seckendorf [lib. 3, s. vii. § 16.]

In some of these visits Cranmer saw Osiander's niece, and obtained her for his wife, whom, when he returned from his embassy, he brought not over with him; but in the year 1534 he privately sent for her, and kept her with him till the year 1539, in the severe time of the Six Articles, when he sent her back in secret to her friends in Germany for a time. By these visits, and this affinity, there grew a very cordial love between Cranmer and Osiander, and a great correspondence was maintained by letters between them long after. A parcel of these letters in manuscript, the right reverend the bishop of Sarum[2] mentioned in his History of the Reformation, which he met with in the exquisite library of Mr. Richard Smith, as he told a friend of mine. But notwithstanding my inquiry after them, I had not the good fortune to see them, nor to find into whose hands they were come, after the selling of that library by auction; which letters, if I could have procured a sight of, might have served somewhat perhaps in this my undertaking.

We are now slipped into the year 1532. And among other services which he did abroad (besides his promoting the king's great matrimonial cause among the German princes and states, as well as others), he was employed for the establishing and securing a traffic between the merchants of England and the emperor's Low Countries, concerning which the former contract, it seems, began to shake, occasioned by that lukewarmness of affection, that now grew between these two monarchs. About this affair our ambassador had divers conferences with Monsieur Grandeville, the emperor's great minister, at Regensburgh [*i. e.* Ratisbon]. The effect of his last solicitation was, that Grandeville had told him that the diet concerning the said contract was held in Flanders, where the queen of Hungary[1] was governess; and therefore that the emperor would do nothing therein without her advice, and that he would make answer by her rather than by him. And so Cranmer desired the king, that it would please his grace no further to look for answer from him therein, but from the queen, unto whom the whole answer was committed.

---

[1] "Multa graviter, multa sapienter, ac plane divinitus de Christiana doctrina, ac vera religione disputares." In Ep. Dedicat. antè Harmon. Evangel.

[2] [Bishop Burnet.]

Another business our ambassador was now agitating at this court for the king, was about sending supplies to the emperor against the Turk, who had now made a formidable invasion in Hungary, with an army consisting of three hundred thousand men. The emperor had lately, by virtue of a former league, and for the common cause of Christianity, demanded certain forces of the king for this purpose. Now what measures his ambassador was to take with the emperor in this affair, William Paget, his majesty's servant (the same that was afterward secretary of state), was despatched to him with instructions, wherein were contained what answer he should make to the emperor's demands, which he reported accordingly to Grandeville; the which answer he delivered to him in writing, upon the desire of Grandeville, for this reason, as he urged, that he might relate the same the more truly to the emperor. He was now, in the month of September, drawing towards the Turk from Abagh, a place not far from Regensburgh, where our English ambassador now resided; not yet having returned any reply to him, prevented by that hurry of business that then lay upon the emperor. So that upon Grandeville's intimation to repair unto the emperor at Lintz, which was in his way to Vienna, and that there he should have an answer in writing again, the ambassador followed thither, in company with the ambassador of France. And so he, with the other ambassador, in eight or ten days' space, furnished themselves with waggons, horses, ships, tents, and other things necessary to the journey, for themselves and their train.

---

[1] [This was Charles V.'s sister Mary, who was governess of the Netherlands, as well as dowager-queen of Hungary.]

But before his departure, he informed the king of the news in those parts; as, that the Turk resided still in Hungary in the same place, environed on all parts, of which more at large he had written in his former letters. That King Ferdinand, the emperor's brother, who was then at Regensburgh,[1] was to meet the emperor at Passau, fourteen miles from thence; and so both were to pass forth to Lintz, which was the midway from Regensburgh to Vienna. That the emperor would tarry there to take counsel what to do, and there all the ambassadors should know his pleasure.

He sent the king also the copy of the emperor's proclamation concerning a general council, and a reformation to be had in Germany, for the controversies of the faith, which he was constrained to do, his affairs with the Turk pressing him so much. The sum thereof was, "That his imperial majesty declared peace throughout all Germany, enjoining that none should be molested for the cause of religion, until the council should be called; or, in case there were none, until some other means should be found out by the states of the empire for healing the present divisions. And that he would use his utmost diligence that a council should be denounced within six months, and the year after to be commenced. And that if this could not be obtained, then these matters should be referred to the imperial diets, to be handled there. That in the mean time all judicial proceedings relating to religion should be suspended; and that no lawsuits should hereafter be commenced against the Protestants; and that in case any were, he commanded that they should be void and null."[2] This edict was published in the month of August this year.

Together with the aforesaid proclamation, he transferred over to the king the tax of all the states of the empire; that is, how many soldiers every man was limited to find for aid against the Turk. Whence our ambassador made a particular observation to his master, for his better direction, what number of forces it were equal for him to send, and to justify his refusal to comply with the emperor, in case he should have demanded more than was his proportion, taking his measures from the said tax. And the observation which he made was this, that his grace might perceive that the greatest prince in Germany (only the duke of Burgundy, and Austria excepted), was not appointed above 120 horsemen, and 554 footmen. A transcript of this letter of Cranmer to the king I have put in the Appendix.[1] These passages will serve to show Dr. Cranmer's diligence, wisdom, and other abilities, in the quality he now stood in of an ambassador.

---

[1] [*i. e.* Ratisbon.]

[2] Sleid. Comment. [lib. viii. p. 134].

Being now resident in the emperor's court, the king made use of him in another embassy, but to be more secretly made, to the elector Frederick, duke of Saxony, that the emperor might not be privy to it. For in the month of July, Dr. Cranmer departed incognito from Ratisbon (where the emperor was, and had there appointed a diet, in order to the coming to some terms of peace with the Protestants, until a council should be called), and came privately to the duke, then abiding in a certain hospital, as it was called, and delivered letters to him, and to Philip duke of Lunenburgh, and Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt.[2] At this first congress, he assured the elector of his master, the king of England's friendship, as the letters he delivered imported. The next day he returned to the elector's court, Pontanus and Spalatinus, two of the elector's counsellors, being present. Here at this meeting he required divers things concerning peace with the emperor, the state of religion, aid against the Turk, and the goods of the Church, which the princes were said to invade. He spake magnificent things of the king, his master, as what mighty aids he had offered the emperor against the Turk, and as he told them the French king would do. And so taking letters to the king from Frederick, dated July 15, he was dismissed. But four days after, he came again privately with one servant only, and had conference with Spalatinus all alone, telling him that he had forgot, as he pretended, one part of his message; and that was, that not only his master, but the French king, was ready to give assistance to the elector and his confederates in the case of religion. And he desired to know in what state the business of the election of Ferdinand stood, whom, being the emperor's brother, he had made king of the Romans by a pretended election, which election gave offence, and Frederick, duke of Saxony, had manifested imperfect and defective. What answer was given to Cranmer was not known; only it was thought that this was somewhat unseasonably acted, because, saith my author, there was peace at this time between the emperor and the English, which the king's ambassador, by those offers, did desire to disturb.[1] This, it seems, was the judgment of the Protestants concerning this overture to them by the king's ambassador, as though it were not sincere; but I do find but that, whatsoever peace was now between the emperor and the English, the former league with him was shaking by reason of the emperor's disobliging the king, in siding so earnestly with Queen Katharine, in the controversy between the king and her.

---

[1] No. II.

[2] Hist. Lutheranism, by Seckendorf [lib. ii, s. vii. § 16].

CHAPTER IV.

Cranmer made Archbishop of Canterbury.

And this great trust the king, his gracious master, committed to him, as a mark of the honour he had for him, and a sign of further preferment he was minded to advance him to. And about this very time happened a fair opportunity to the king to manifest his favour to him: Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, departing this mortal life, whereby that see became vacant. The preferment indeed seemed too great for Cranmer at one stride to step into, without some other intervening dignities to have been first conferred on him. But the king, thinking him the fittest man of all the English clergy to be promoted to this high office, resolved to give it to him, though now absent abroad upon his business.

---

[1] Seckendorf, ubi supra.

Hereupon the king commanded him to hasten home, though he concealed the reason from him, which was to take the archbishopric he had designed for him. Which, when he came home, in obedience to his majesty, though much against his inclination, and after many refusals, proceeding from his great modesty and humility, and certain scruples, at length he did accept.

It doth not appear to me what ecclesiastical places he had before; only that he was the king's chaplain, and archdeacon of Taunton. The pope also, in honour to his master, had constituted him penitentiary general of England. He had also a benefice, while he lived in the earl of Wiltshire's family, which was bestowed upon him by the king; a mention whereof I find in one of his letters to the said earl.

It was in the month of August 1532, that William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, died; a wise and grave man, a great patron of the most learned Erasmus, and once lord chancellor of England, who seemed to foresee and foretell, or at least to conjecture, that Thomas Cranmer should succeed him, as judging him, in his own mind, the fittest person for the king's and Church's service, in that juncture, to enter upon that see. For this truth, methinks, we may pick out of those malicious words of Harpsfield in his Ecclesiastical History, viz.: that Archbishop Warham should say, "That a Thomas should succeed him; who, by a loose and remiss indulgence of a licentious sort of life granted to the people, and by unsound doctrines, would more disgrace the church of Canterbury, and all the rest of the Church of England, than Thomas the Martyr did amplify it by his martyrdom. And that he admonished his nephew and namesake, William Warham, archdeacon of Canterbury, that if any Thomas should succeed in the see while he lived, he should not by any means enter into his service."[1]

It is not unusual (nay it is seldom otherwise) for popish historians to stuff their histories with strange prophecies and falsehoods, mixed with some truth. And I suppose the matter might be no more than this: This grave and sober archbishop was sensible of the gross encroachments of the bishops of Rome upon the authority of the kings of this realm in their own dominions; and his judgment stood for the restoring of this imperial crown to its ancient right and sovereignty, and for the abridging the Papal power. And knowing how learned a man Dr. Thomas Cranmer was, and perceiving what an able instrument he was like to prove in vindicating the king's right to the supremacy in his own kingdoms, the archbishop upon these accounts might think him the fittest to succeed in the archiepiscopal chair, and might have some reason to believe that the king intended him thereunto.

---

[1] [Harpsfield, Histor. Ang. Eccles. p. 633.]

And that Archbishop Warham was of this judgment, it may appear, if we trace some footsteps of him. In the year 1530, when all the clergy were under a *præmunire*, and a petition was drawing up in the Convocation for that cause, the king in the said petition was addressed to by the title of "Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England." At this title, when the archbishop found some of the clergy to boggle, who were yet afraid openly to declare their disallowance of it, he took the opportunity of their silence to pass the title, by saying that "silence was to be taken for their consent."

In the last synod, wherein this archbishop was a member, and the main director, many things were debated about abolishing the Papacy. This synod was prorogued from April 26 to October 5. In the mean time he died. But had he lived and been well unto the next sessions, some further steps had been made in evacuating the bishop of Rome's usurpations; as may be guessed by what was done under his influence the last sessions, when the supremacy of that foreign prelate was rejected.[1]

Something more of this archbishop's endeavours of restoring the king to his supremacy appears by what Archbishop Cranmer said to Brooks, bishop of Gloucester, before a great assembly, not long before his burning. Brooks had charged him for first setting up the king's supremacy. To which Cranmer replied, "That it was Warham gave the supremacy to Henry VIII. and that he had said he ought to have it before the bishop of Rome, and that God's word would bear it. And that upon this, the universities of Cambridge and Oxford were sent to, to know what the word of God would allow touching the supremacy. Where it was reasoned and argued upon at length: and at last both agreed and set to their seals, and sent it to the king, that he ought to be supreme head, and not the pope." All which was in Archbishop Warham's time, and while he was alive, three quarters of a year before ever Cranmer had the archbishopric of Canterbury, as he also added in that audience.

---

[1] [Parker, de] Ant. Brit. [p. 379].

So that, these things considered, we may conclude that Warham did think that none would be so fit to come after him as Cranmer, a learned and diligent man, to carry on this cause, which he, before him, had begun; and so might speak of him as the properest person to be advanced to this see.

To this I will add the sense of an ingenious and learned friend of mine concerning this passage in Harpsfield's history; which the author also of the *Athenæ Oxonienses*[1] hath made use of to the good archbishop's discredit; and which Somner also had unluckily selected, though without design, to hurt his good name, and is all he writes of him.[2] But may it not be considered, saith he, that the pretended martyr Thomas Becket, though he died in vindication of the privileges of the Church, yet he was the first betrayer of the rights of his see? He made the greatest breach upon the authority of the primacy of Canterbury, by resigning the archbishopric into the pope's hands, and receiving it again from him, as the pope's donation. But it is the honour of the blessed martyr, Thomas Cranmer, that he was the first who began to claim the primacy, and retrieve the rights of his see from being slavishly subjected to the Roman power. Indeed, little credit is to be given to the author who first published this story; considering what a violent man he was, and how much prejudiced against Cranmer, and interested in the Popish cause; and coming into the archdeaconry of Canterbury by the deprivation of the archbishop's brother.

Cranmer *noluit episcopari*—had no mind to be archbishop. He loved his studies, and affected retirement, and well knew the dangers and temptations of a public station. But especially he could not induce his mind to take his office from the pope, and to swear fidelity to him as well as to the king; whereby he should ensnare himself in two contrary oaths. Wherefore, when the king sent for him home from his embassy in Germany, with a design to lay that honourable burden upon him, he, guessing the reason, first endeavoured to delay his coming, by signifying to the king some matters of importance that would require his tarrying there somewhat longer for the king's service; hoping in that while the king might have bestowed the place upon some other. In fine, our historians say, he stayed abroad one half-year longer. But I find him in England in the month of November, which was not much more than a quarter of a year after Warham's death.[1] Then the king was married to the marchioness of Pembroke, and Cranmer was present. So that the king must have sent for him home in June, two or three months before the archbishop's death; probably while he was in a declining, dying condition. But after, when that which Cranmer seemed to suspect of certain emergencies in those parts, wherein the English state might be concerned, fell not out; the king again commanded his return home. Now, more perfectly knowing, by some of his friends, the king's intentions to make him archbishop, he made means, by divers of his friends, to shift it off, desiring rather some smaller living.

---

[1] [Anthony à Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. 739.]

[2] Antiq. of Cant. [p. 272].

At length the king brake his mind to him, that it was his full purpose to bestow that dignity upon him for his service, and for the good opinion he conceived of him. But his long disabling himself nothing dissuaded the king, till at last he humbly craved the king's pardon for that he should declare to him, and that was,—"That if he should accept it, he must receive it at the pope's hand, which he neither would nor could do; for that his highness was the only supreme governor of the Church of England, as well in causes ecclesiastical as temporal; and that the full right of donation of all manner of benefices and bishoprics, as well as any other temporal dignities and promotions, appertained to him, and not to any other foreign authority. And therefore if he might serve God, him, and his country, in that vocation, he would accept it of his majesty, and of no stranger, who had no authority within this realm."[1] Whereat the king made a pause, and then asked him how he was able to prove it. At which time he alleged several texts out of Scripture and the Fathers, proving the supreme authority of kings in their own realms and dominions: and withal showing the intolerable usurpations of the bishops of Rome. Of this the king talked several times with him, and perceiving that he could not be brought to acknowledge the pope's authority, the king called one Dr. Oliver, an eminent lawyer, and other civilians, and devised with them how he might bestow the archbishopric upon him, salving his conscience. They said he might do it by way of protestation; and so one to be sent to Rome to take the oath, and do everything in his name. Cranmer said to this, it should be *super animam suam;* and seemed to be satisfied in what the lawyers told him. And accordingly, when he was consecrated, made his protestation,—"That he did not admit the pope's authority any further than it agreed with the express word of God; and that it might be lawful for him at all times to speak against him, and to impugn his errors, when there should be occasion." And so he did.

---

[1] [*i. e.* August 23, 1532. Cranmer was not in England at this time. Ann Boleyn, who was created marchioness of Pembroke in the following month, was not married on the 14th November, but on St. Paul's day, January 25, 1532-3; and Cranmer was not present at the marriage. See Parker Society edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. pp. 242, 246.]

Whether Warham, the archdeacon, had conceived any prejudice against our new archbishop, by some warning given him by the former archbishop, as was hinted above;[2] or whether he was willing to give place upon Cranmer's entreaty, that he might provide for his brother; so it was, that Edmund Cranmer, brother to the archbishop, succeeded Warham in the archdeaconry of Canterbury, and the provostship of Wingham; who parted with both these dignities by cession;[3] and by the privity and consent of the archbishop, he had a stipend or pension of sixty pounds per annum allowed him, during his life, out of the archdeaconry; and twenty pounds per annum out of Wingham, by his successor aforesaid; who continued archdeacon until Queen Mary's days, and was then deprived; and his prebend, and his parsonage of Ickham, all taken from him in the year

---

[1] [This is in accordance with Cranmer's own statement, when he was examined at Oxford, previous to his martyrdom. See Fox's Acts and Mon. vol. viii. p. 66.]

[2] [p. 20.]

[3] Somner, Hist. of Canterbury, p. 322, ex lib. Eccles. Cant.

1554, for being a married clerk. The first was given to Nicholas Harpsfield; the second to Robert Collins, bachelor of law, and commissary of Canterbury; and the third to Robert Marsh.

The king had before linked him into his great business about Queen Katharine and the Lady Ann. So now, when he had nominated him for archbishop, he made him a party and an actor in every step almost which he took in that affair. For to fetch the matter a little backward; not long before the archiepiscopal see was devolved upon Cranmer, the king had created the Lady Ann marchioness of Pembroke, and taken her along with him in great state into France; when, by their mutual consent, there was an interview appointed between the two kings. At Calais King Henry permitted Francis, the French king, to take a view of this lady, who then made both kings a curious and rich mask, where both honoured her by dancing: this was in the month of October. In the month before,[1] I find a parcel of very rich jewels were sent from Greenwich to Hampton Court by Mr. Norrys; probably he who was groom of the stole, and executed upon Queen Ann's business afterwards. Which jewels, as some of them might be for the king's own wearing, now he was going into France; so in all probability others were either lent or given to the marchioness to adorn and make her fine, when she should appear and give her entertaiment to the French king. For the sake of such as be curious, I have set down, in the Appendix,[2] a particular of these most splendid and royal jewels, from an original signed with the king's own hand in token of his receipt of them.

Immediately after the king's and the marchioness's return from France, he married her, at which wedding, though very private, the archbishop was one that assisted, according to the Lord Herbert; but, according to the author of the Britannic Antiquities, did the sacred office.[3] When she was crowned queen,[4] which was Whitsuntide following, the archbishop performed the ceremonies. When, after that, the king had a daughter by her,[1] he would have the archbishop assist at the christening, and be her godfather. And before this, when Queen Katharine was to be divorced from the king, and the pope's dispensation of that marriage declared null, our archbishop pronounced the sentence, and made the declaration solemnly and publicly at Dunstable Priory.[2] Thus the king dipped and engaged Cranmer with himself in all his proceeding in this cause. Now, as all these doings had danger in them, so especially this last highly provoked the pope for doing this without his leave and authority, as being a presumptuous encroachment upon his prerogative. Insomuch, that a public act was made at Rome, that unless the king undid all that he had done, and restored all things *in integrum*, leaving them to his decision, he would excommunicate him. And this sentence was affixed and set up publicly at Dunkirk, which put the king upon an appeal from the pope to the next general council, lawfully called. The archbishop also, foreseeing the pope's threatening hovering likewise over his head, by the king's advice, made his appeal by the English ambassador there. I have seen the king's original letter to Dr. Bonner, ordering him to signify to the pope, in order and form of law, his appeal, sending him also the instrument of his appeal, with the proxy devised for that purpose. This bare date August 18th, from his castle at Windsor. I have reposited it in the Appendix;[3] which order of the king, Bonner did accordingly discharge at an audience he got of the pope at Marseilles, November 7. And that letter, which the Lord Herbert saith he saw of Bonner to the king, wherein he signified as much, must be his answer to this of the king to him.[4]

---

[1] September 21.

[2] Appendix, No. III.

[3] "Rex [nihilominus] D. Annam Bullenam, Thoma Cranmero sacra ministrante, uxorem duxit." [Parker, de Antiq. Brit. p. 384.]

[4] [The coronation took place on Whit Sunday, June 1st, 1533.]

Dr. Cranmer having now yielded to the king to accept the archbishopric, it was in the beginning of the next year, viz. 1533, March 30, and in the 24th of King Henry, that he received his consecration; but that ushered in with abundance of bulls, some dated in February, and some in March, from Pope Clement, to the number of eleven, as may be seen at length in the beginning of this archbishop's Register.

---

[1] [The Princess Elizabeth, afterwards queen, was born Sunday, September 7th, 1533. See Parker Society edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 274.]

[2] [*i. e.* May 23rd; on the 28th of the same month he confirmed Ann Boleyn's marriage with the king.]

[3] No. IV.

[4] [Life of Henry VIII. p. 395.]

The first was to King Henry, upon his nomination of Cranmer to him to be archbishop. The pope alloweth and promoteth him accordingly. The second was a bull to Cranmer himself, signifying the same. The third bull absolved him from any sentences of excommunication, suspension, interdiction, &c. It was written from the pope to him, under the title of archdeacon of Taunton, in the church of Wells, and master in theology, and ran thus:—

"Nos ne forsan aliquibus sententiis, censuris et pœnis Ecclesiasticis, ligatus sis, &c. Volentes te a quibusvis excommunicationis, suspensionis, et interdicti, aliisque Ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris, et pœnis, a jure vel ab homine, quavis occasione vel causa latis, &c. Authoritate prædicta, tenore præsentium, absolvimus, et absolutum fore nuntiamus, non obstantibus constitutionibus, et ordinationibus Apostolicis, &c." One might think that this bull was drawn up peculiarly for Cranmer's case, who, by reason he might have been suspected as infected with Lutheranism, or had meddled too much in the king's matrimonial cause; and so entangled in the Church's censures, might have need of such assoiling. But I suppose it was but a customary bull. A fourth bull was to the suffragans of Canterbury, that is, to all the bishops in the province, signifying Cranmer's advancement to be their metropolitan. Another to the city and diocese of Canterbury. Another to the chapter of the said church. Another to the vassals of the church; that is, to all such as held lands of it. Another to the people of the city. Another, wherewith the pall was sent to [Lee] the archbishop of York, and [Stokesley] the bishop of London. Another, of the destination of the pall, which, the bull saith, was taken *de corpore B. Petri*, to be presented to him by the archbishop of York and the bishop of London, or one of them, after he had received the gift of consecration. In this bull of the destination is an order, not to use the pall but on those proper days which were expressly mentioned in the privileges of the Church, on purpose to beget a greater esteem and veneration of this, and whatsoever baubles else came from Rome, and brought such treasure thither.

The archbishop, according to custom, received these bulls, which the pope sent him to invest him with the archbishopric. But he surrendered them up to the king, because he would not own the pope as the giver of this ecclesiastical dignity, but the king only, as he declared at his trial before Queen Mary's commissioners at Oxford, in the year 1555.

As to the act of consecration; first, they assembled in the chapter-house of the King's College of St. Stephen, near the king's palace of Westminster. Present as witnesses, Watkins, the king's prothonotary; Dr. John Tregonwel; Thomas Bedyl, clerk of the king's council; Richard Guent, doctor of decrees, of the court of Canterbury, principal official; and John Cocks, the archbishop's auditor of the audience, and vicar-general in spirituals. The first thing that was done by the archbishop elect, was for the satisfaction of his conscience; who was now before his consecration to take an oath of fidelity to the pope, which will follow by-and-bye. This he saw consisted by no means with his allegiance to his sovereign; and, therefore, how common and customary soever it were for bishops to take it, yet Cranmer in the first place, in the said chapter-house, before the said witnesses, made a protestation, wherein he declared, that he intended not by the oath that he was to take, and was customary for bishops to take to the pope, to bind himself to do any thing contrary to the laws of God, the king's prerogative, or to the commonwealth and statutes of the kingdom; nor to tie himself up from speaking his mind freely in matters relating to the reformation of religion, the government of the Church of England, and prerogative of the crown; and that according to this interpretation and meaning only he would take the oath, and no otherwise. This protestation, because I think it is not recorded in our historians, except Mason (and in him imperfect),[1] I have put it into the Appendix *verbatim*, as I transcribed it out of the archbishop's Register.[2] And having made this protestation, he had the prothonotary to make one or more public instruments thereof, and desired the forementioned persons to be witnesses thereunto. After this protestation made, he, in the presence of these witnesses, being arrayed in sacerdotal garments, went up to the step of the high altar, to receive consecration; where was sitting in a chair, honourably adorned, John Longland, the bishop of Lincoln, having on his pontificals, assisted by John Voisey, bishop of Exon, and Henry Standish, bishop of St. Asaph, holding in his hand a schedule with the oath, which he was now going to take to the pope; and having withal his protestation, he, before the aforesaid witnesses, asserted and protested, that he would read the schedule, and perform the oath therein contained under the said protestation, which he said he made the same day in the chapter-house before those witnesses, and no otherwise, nor in any other manner. And then presently after, kneeling on his knees, read the schedule, containing the oath to the pope, which I have reposited in the Appendix.[1]

---

[1] De Minister, p. 154.

[2] No. V.

Then the bishops proceeded to the consecrating of the archbishop. And then again, after the solemn consecration was finished, being about to receive his pall, when he was to take another oath to the pope, he protested again, in the presence of the same witnesses, that he took the following oath under the same protestation as he made before in the chapter-house, nor would perform it any other ways; and then took the oath. And after he had taken it, desired the prothonotary the third time to make a public instrument or instruments thereof, which he did.

To these oaths I will add one more, which the archbishop took with a better stomach to the king for his temporalities. This was for the most part the accustomable oath of bishops to the king when they sued for their temporalities; but hardly reconcilable with the oath they had taken to the pope; because in this oath was mentioned a renouncing of all privileges and grants of the pope, by virtue of his bulls, that might be prejudicial to the king, and an acknowledgment that they held their bishoprics only of the king, which the archbishop worded more fully, viz. That he held his archbishopric of the king immediately and only, and of none other. I refer the reader to the Appendix for this oath.[2]

One of the first services the archbishop did for the king

[1] No. VI.

[2] No. VII.

was the pronouncing the sentence of divorce from his former queen, Katharine, which was done May 23; but drew an implacable hatred upon him from the pope and emperor abroad, as well as the papists at home. And Queen Mary would not forget it when she came to the crown, taking then her full revenge upon him; though in the same commission, wherein this sentence was pronounced, sat the bishops of Winton [Gardiner], London [Stokesley], Bath [Clerk], Lincoln [Longland], and many other great clerks. And though he pronounced the sentence, he was but the mouth of the rest, and they were all in as deep as he.

There is a short account of Archbishop Cranmer's judgment of the unlawfulness of this marriage, digested under twelve articles, with his own name writ by himself on the top of the paper, which Bishop Burnet transcribed from a Cotton manuscript, and inserted into his history.[1] It bears this title: "Articuli ex quibus plane admodum demonstratur, divortium inter Henricum VIII. Angliæ regem invictissimum, et serenissimam Catharinam necessario esse faciendum." The twelfth and concluding article is this: "We think that the pretended matrimony of Henry, king of England, and Katharine the queen, hath been and is none at all; being prohibited both by the law of God and nature."

CHAPTER V.

The Archbishop visits his Diocese.

After his sentence against Queen Katharine, and confirmation of Queen Ann's marriage, one thing he did, which looked as if he was not like to prove any great friend to a reformation; for he forbad all preaching throughout his diocese, and warned the rest of the bishops throughout England to do the same, as I have it from an old journal made by a monk of St. Augustine's, Canterbury.[2] But this was only for a time, till orders for preachers and the beads could be finished: it being thought convenient that preaching at this juncture should be restrained, because now the matter of sermons chiefly consisted in tossing about the king's marriage with the Lady Ann, and condemning so publicly and boldly his doings against Queen Katharine; the priests being set on work by her friends and faction.

---

[1] Vol. i. Collect. p. 95 [vol. i. part ii. b. ii. p. 151].

[2] Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxix. 112].

In October or November the archbishop went down to Canterbury in order to a visitation.

The third day of December the archbishop received the pontifical seat in the monastery of the Holy Trinity.[1] And soon after, viz. the ninth of the same month, began to go on visitation throughout all his diocese, that he might have finished that work before the sessions of the Parliament.

This same year a remarkable delusion was discovered in the archbishop's diocese, and even under his nose, the scene being chiefly laid in Canterbury, by some belonging to the cathedral church. For a certain nun, called Elizabeth Barton, by marvellous hypocrisy mocked all Kent, and almost all England; for which cause she was put in prison in London; where she confessed many horrible things against the king and the queen. This forenamed Elizabeth had many adherents, but especially Dr. Bocking, monk of Christ's Church in Canterbury, who was her chief author in her dissimulation. All of them at the last were accused of treason, heresy, and conspiracy; and so stood in penance before the open cross of St. Paul's in London; and in Canterbury, in the churchyard of the monastery of the Holy Trinity, at the sermon time, they stood over the high seat; where of the preacher they were grievously rebuked for their horrible fact. And in April the next year, she, with Bocking, and Dering, another monk of Canterbury, were led out of prison through all the streets of London unto Tyburn, where she and these monks, and also two brothers of the minors, suffered with the rest upon the gallows for treason and heresy.

In the month of November the archbishop sent a letter to Bonner, the king's ambassador at Marseilles, together with his appeal from the pope, to be there signified, as was hinted before. The reason whereof was this: upon the king's divorce from Queen Katharine, the pope had, by a public instrument, declared the divorce to be null and void, and threatened him with excommunication, unless he would revoke all that he had done. Gardiner, bishop of Winton, about this time, and upon this occasion, was sent ambassador to the French king; and Bonner soon after followed him to Marseilles, where Gardiner, at the interview between the French king and the pope, now was: for the king and the council apprehended some mischief to be hatching against the kingdom by the pope; who was now inciting the emperor and other princes to make war upon us. And indeed he had vaunted, as the Lord Herbert declares, that he would set all Christendom against the king. And the emperor in discourse had averred that by the means of Scotland he would avenge his aunt's quarrel. The archbishop in this juncture had secret intimation of a design to excommunicate him, and interdict his church. Whereupon, as the king by Bonner, November 7, had made his appeal from the pope to the next general council lawfully called; so, by the king and council's advice, the archbishop soon after did the same; sending his appeal with his proxy, under his seal, to Bonner, desiring him, together with Gardiner, to consult together, and to intimate his appeal in the best manner they could think expedient for him. And this letter he wrote by the king's own commandment. It was not the hand of the archbishop, nor of his secretary; so I suppose it was drawn up by some of his own lawyers; and is as followeth:

---

[1] August. Monk's Journal [Harl. MSS. ccccxix. 112].

"In my right hearty manner I commend me to you. So it is, as you know right well, I stand in dread, lest our holy father the pope do intend to make some manner of prejudicial process against me and my church. And therefore, having probable conjectures thereof, I have appealed from his holiness to the general council, accordingly as his highness and his council have advised me to do. Which my appeal and procuracy under my seal I do send unto you herewith, desiring you right heartily to have me commended to my lord of Winchester (Gardiner), and with his advice and counsel to intimate the said provocation after the best manner that his lordship and you shall think most expedient for me. I am the bolder thus to write unto you, because the king's highness commandeth me thus to do, as you shall, I trust, further perceive by his grace's letters; nothing doubting in your goodness, but at this mine own desire you will be contented to take this pains, though his highness shall percase forget to write unto you therein. Which your pains and kindness, if it shall lie in me in time to come to recompense, I will not forget it with God's grace: who preserve you, as myself. From Lambeth, the 27th day of November.

"THOMAS CANTUAR."[1]

Cranmer being now placed at the head of the Church of England, next under God and the king, and the chief care of it devolved upon him, his great study was conscientiously to discharge this high vocation. And one of the first things wherein he showed his good service to the Church was done in the Parliament in the latter end of this year 1533. When the supremacy came under debate, and the usurped power of the bishop of Rome was propounded, then the old collections of the new archbishop did him good service; for the chief, and in a manner the whole burden of this weighty cause was laid upon his shoulders. Insomuch that he was forced to answer to all that ever the whole rabble of the papists could say for the defence of the pope's supremacy: and he answered so plainly, directly, and truly to all their arguments, and proved so evidently and stoutly, both by the word of God and consent of the primitive Church, that this usurped power of the pope is a mere tyranny, and directly against the law of God; and that the power of emperors and kings is the highest power here upon earth; unto which bishops, priests, popes, and cardinals ought to submit themselves, and are as much bound to obey as their temporal subjects or laymen (as the priests call them); that the issue was the abolishing of that foreign papal power, and the expulsion of it out of this realm, by the full consent of Parliament.[2]

A license, dated February 13, this year, was granted by the archbishop to Mary, the relict of Sir Henry Guilford, knight, to have the eucharist, matrimony, and baptism ministered in any chapel or oratory within her manors, where she should reside, during her life.[3] And such a license, dated also February 13, the next year, was granted by him to Margaret, marchioness of Dorset; whether indulged to them by the archbishop, the rather to free them from danger for not frequenting their parish churches, and for the avoiding the superstitious and idolatrous worship there performed; and that there might be some private places for purer worshipping God, and administration of the sacraments, or only for the convenience of those ladies, the reader hath liberty to judge.

---

[1] Cleopat. E. 6. [234.]

[2] Life of Cranmer, inter Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxvii. 90.]

[3] Cran. Reg.

CHAPTER VI.

The Archbishop presseth the Translation of the Bible.

This rub of the papal power being now taken out of the way, and the king's supremacy settled in the next sessions of Parliament, in November 1534, a way was opened for a reformation of errors and abuses in religion. So that, as the archbishop judged it a thing impossible to make any amendment of religion under the pope's dominion, so he thought it now (the same being despatched out of the realm), a meet time to restore the true doctrine of Christ, according to the word of God, and the old primitive Church, within his jurisdiction and cure; and, with the said pope, to abolish also all false doctrine, errors, and heresies, by him brought into the Church, for the accomplishing of which he let pass no opportunities.

A convocation now afforded him one. Our archbishop, from his first entrance upon his dignity, had it much in his mind to get the Holy Scriptures put into the vulgar language, and a liberty for all to read them. The convocation now was so well disposed, by the influence of the archbishop and his friends, that they did petition the king, that the Bible might be translated by some learned men of his highness' nomination. And as this good motion was briefly made in the house by the archbishop, so they agreed upon him to carry their petition. But they clogged it with another, which the archbishop did not so well approve of; for about the month of December they passed this order of convocation:—"The bishops, abbots, priors, of this upper house of convocation, of the province of Canterbury, met together in the chapter-house of St Paul, unanimously did consent, that the most reverend father, the archbishop, should make instance in their names to the king, that his majesty would vouchsafe, for the increase of the faith of his subjects, to decree and command that all his subjects, in whose possession any books of suspect doctrine were, especially in the vulgar language, imprinted beyond or on this side the sea, should be warned, within three months, to bring them in before persons to be appointed by the king, under a certain pain, to be limited by the king.

"And that moreover, his majesty would vouchsafe to decree, that the Scriptures should be translated into the vulgar tongue, by some honest and learned men, to be nominated by the king, and to be delivered unto the people according to their learning." This was resolved in the convocation, December 19.

Accordingly the king issued out soon after his proclamation. What this proclamation was I do not know, unless it were one I meet with about this time, against bringing in or printing seditious books of Anabaptists and Sacramentaries, who were said to be lately come into the realm, and against some of his own subjects, who publicly disputed in taverns and other open places upon those points of religion which the king was offended withal, for the correction and regulating of which the king, in the said proclamation, commanded sundry articles to be observed, which for the length of them I have put into the Appendix.[1] Unless perhaps this proclamation may belong to the year 1538.

About the month of June this year, was a book drawn up for bishops and priests, wherein was an order for preaching; and in the same were forms devised for the beads, as well for preachers as curates, in which forms the king's title of *Supreme Head* was specified. In this book was commandment given by the king, that every preacher should, before Easter, once in solemn audience, declare the usurped jurisdiction, within this realm, of the bishop of Rome, and the king's just cause to decline from the same; and also to open and declare such things as might avow and justify the king's refusal of marriage with the princess dowager, and his contract anew with Queen Ann. And also in the same book, an order was given for the suppression of the general sentence or curse. This book the archbishop, who we may well suppose had a great hand in it, sent, by the king's commandment, to all the bishops, and to [Lee] the archbishop of York, though out of his province; that archbishop lying under some jealousy, as it seems, with the king.

---

[1] No. VIII.

Therefore, after the receipt of the book, the said archbishop of York the next Sunday, which was the second Sunday after Trinity, went from Cawood to York, and there in his own person declared as well the king's cause touching the matrimony, as his refusal of the pope's jurisdiction so fully, that nothing that needed to be opened was left unspoken, as that archbishop wrote himself to the king in his own vindication. And that the auditory might be the greater, he sent to York forthwith, upon the receipt of the book, to publish there that he would be there the next Sunday following, and caused the churches to make an end of their service in such time, as every man might have opportunity to be at the sermon; and especially required the mayor and his brethren, and one Mr. Magnus, and Sir George Lawson, his majesty's chaplains, to be there, and a very great confluence there was. Then the archbishop preached from that text, *Uxorem duxi*, &c., whence he took occasion to utter and declare both his foresaid matters, and the injury done to the king's highness of Pope Clement.

As the convocation this year had declared the pope to have no jurisdiction in this kingdom, so this would not serve the king till all the learned and spiritual men in England had subscribed to it with their hands. The archbishop's church of Canterbury began; for the prior and convent thereof, moved and influenced not a little by their diocesan, solemnly subscribed an instrument for abolishing the pope's supremacy, and for acknowledgment of the king, supreme head of the Church of England, under this position:—

> "Quod Romanus episcopus non habet majorem aliquam jurisdictionem a Deo sibi collatam in hoc regno Angliæ, quam quivis externus episcopus." That is,

"That the bishop of Rome hath not some greater jurisdiction conferred upon him by God in this realm of England, than any other foreign bishop."[1]

This was consented to by the prior's own hand subscribed, and sixty-nine of the convent besides, the original whereof is in a volume of the Cotton library.[2] In another place of the same volume is extant the subscription of the bishops, deans, and several abbots; and after that of the University of Oxford, and all the particular colleges; and after that the names of all the subscribing priors of England.

The archbishop was one employed about the act of succession, that was made the last sessions of Parliament, which was to invest the succession to the crown upon the heirs of Queen Ann; and that Queen Katharine should be no more called queen, but princess dowager. In the preamble to the act, there were certain touches against the pope's supremacy, and against his power of dispensing in the king's former marriage with his brother's wife, carnally known by him. To this act all persons were to swear, to accept and maintain the same, upon pain of treason. The archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor Audley, Secretary Crumwel, the abbot [Boston or Benson] of Westminster, and others, were the king's commissioners appointed to tender this oath. The nobility and gentry took it, none denying, to which they set their hands in a long list.

On the 13th of April, the commissioners sat at Lambeth to receive the oaths of the clergy, and chiefly those of London, that had not yet sworn, who all took it, not one excepted. And a certain doctor, vicar of Croydon, that it seems made some boggle before, went up with the rest, of whom Sir Thomas More, who then stood by, made an observation how, as he passed, he went to my lord's buttery-hatch, and called for drink, and drank *valde familiariter:* whether, saith he, sarcastically, it were for gladness, or dryness, or *quod ille notus erat pontifici.* The oath also now was taken by Dr. Wilson, a great court divine in those days, who for Queen Katharine's business was a prisoner at this time, though a great while he was unsatisfied, and consulted much with Sir Thomas More about the lawfulness of taking it.

---

[1] Cleopat. E. 6. p. 208.

[2] Page 458.

The same day were conveyed hither from the Tower, Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, the only layman at this meeting, to tender this oath to them; who both, being separately called, refused it. After the clergy were sworn and despatched, immediately Sir Thomas by himself was sent for the second time. Now he had much talk with the lords, who would fain have brought him to comply. They urged him to declare the causes why he would not swear; but he excused his so doing. Then they charged him with obstinacy; he said, it was not obstinacy, but because he might not declare his mind without peril of incurring the king's further displeasure. He told the commissioners, that for his part he condemned not the consciences of any; but that he was dissatisfied in his own conscience for certain reasons. The archbishop taking hold of this, spake to him thus:—"That it appeared well, that Sir Thomas did not take it for a very sure thing and a certain, that he might not lawfully swear, but rather as a thing uncertain and doubtful. But you know, said my lord, for a certainty and for a thing without doubt, that you be bound to obey your sovereign lord the king. And therefore are you bound to leave off the doubt of your unsure conscience, in refusing the oath, and take the sure way in obeying of your prince, who commands you to swear." This argument, as Sir Thomas confessed in one of his letters to his daughter Roper, seemed so subtle, and with such authority coming out of so noble a prelate's mouth, that he could answer again nothing thereto; but only that he thought with himself, that he might not so do, because that in his conscience this was one of the causes, in which he was bounden, that he should not obey his prince; sith that whatsoever other folks thought in the matter (whose conscience or learning, as he said, he would not condemn, or take upon him to judge), yet in his conscience the truth seemed on the other side, wherein he had informed his conscience neither suddenly nor slightly, but by long leisure and diligent search for the matter.

In fine, the farthest Sir Thomas could be brought, and which he offered voluntarily that morning, was to swear to the succession (which was the main design of the act), though not to the preamble. At parting, the lord chancellor bade the secretary, before More, take notice that More denied not, but was content to swear [to] the succession. More assented, and said, in that point he would be contented, so that he might see the oath so framed as might stand with his conscience.

Fisher, bishop of Rochester, offered the same before this assembly that More had done; and in a letter of his, afterwards writ to the secretary, assigned the reason why he could, with a good conscience, swear to the succession, viz.: because he doubted not but that the prince of a realm, with the assent of the nobles and commons, might appoint his successors according as he pleased. In the Appendix[1] this letter will be found, which Bishop Fisher writ upon occasion of the secretary's advice, who laboured to gain him, that he should write to the king, to declare his mind to him in swearing to the succession; and to petition him to let that suffice, because his conscience could not consent to the rest of the act. The secretary also had sent unto Fisher, lying in the Tower, Lee, bishop elect of Lichfield and Coventry: to whom he declared again, that he would take the oath to the succession; and, moreover, that he would swear never to meddle more in disputation of the matrimony, and promised all allegiance to the king. But he told Lee, his conscience could not be convinced that the marriage was against the law of God, because of a prohibition in the Levitical law. See Lee's letter, in the Appendix, to secretary Crumwel.[2]

The archbishop, soon after the meeting of the commissioners at Lambeth, retired to Croydon; and being a man not kind to his own party and persuasion only, and fierce and bloody-minded to them that differed from him, but compassionate towards all, friend and foe—his tender spirit suggested to him to make this serve for an occasion to intercede for More and Fisher to Crumwel; showing him in a letter, dated April the 17th, how advisable in his judgment it would be to be satisfied with that oath they had offered to swear, in case they would swear to maintain the said succession against all power and potentates: urging to him that there would be these advantages gained thereby. First, that it would be a means to satisfy the consciences of the princess

[1] No. IX.

[2] No. X.

dowager and the Lady Mary; who it seems made it a matter of conscience and sin to abandon their titles. Also, that it might tend to stop the emperor's mouth, and the mouths of other their friends, when Fisher and More, who had stickled so much for them, should now own that succession, which would be in effect a disowning of them. Secondly, that it might be a means to resolve and quiet also many others in the realm that were in doubt, when such great men should affirm, by oath and subscription, that the succession mentioned in the said act was good, and according to God's laws. And he thought that, after two such had sworn, there would be scarce one in the kingdom would reclaim against it. And thirdly, that though a great many in the realm could not be brought to alter from their opinions of the validity of the king's former marriage, and of the bishop of Rome's authority, that it would be a great point gained, if all with one accord would own and acknowledge the succession.

Weaver, the author of the Funeral Monuments, transcribed this letter out of the Cotton library, and inserted it into his said book; and the thing he takes notice of therein is "the wisdom and policy of the prudent archbishop."[1] I shall take notice of another thing, and which I suppose was the great cause that employed his pen at this time, namely, his tender heart, and abhorrence from bloodshedding; propounding these politic considerations to the secretary, which were the properest arguments to be used with a statesman, and for him to use and urge before the king; that so he might be an instrument of saving the lives of these men, however they differed from him, and it may be were none of his very good friends. This letter of the archbishop's, as I myself took it from the original, I thought worthy depositing among Cranmer's monuments in the Appendix.[2] But this offer of theirs, notwithstanding the archbishop's arguments and endeavours, would not be accepted. The king would not be satisfied with this swearing by halves.

[1] [Page 507.]

[2] No. XI.

CHAPTER VII.

The Archbishop visits the Diocese of Norwich.

THE popish bishops were now at a low ebb, and, being under the frowns of their prince, other men took the opportunities upon their lips to get them punished. A storm now fell upon Richard Nix, bishop of Norwich, a vicious and dissolute man, as Godwin writes.[1] Against him was a *præmunire* this year (25 of Henry VIII.) brought. That, *de tout temps*, there had been a custom in the town of Thetford, in the county of Norfolk, that no inhabitant of the same town should be drawn in plea in any court Christian for any spiritual causes, but before the dean in the said town. And there was a presentment in the king's court before the mayor of the town, by twelve jurors, that there was such a custom. And beside, that whosoever should draw any man out of the said town, in any spiritual court, should forfeit six shillings and eightpence. The bishop nevertheless cited the mayor to appear before him, *pro salute animæ;* and upon his appearance libelled for that cause, and enjoined him, upon pain of excommunication, not to admit the said presentment. And when, as the bishop could not deny his fact, judgment was given, that he should be out of the king's protection, his goods and chattels forfeited, and his body imprisoned during the king's pleasure. For which he had the king's pardon. Which was afterwards confirmed in Parliament.

This bishop's diocese was now in such disorder, that the archbishop instituted a visitation of that see; wherein William May, LL.D., was the archbishop's commissary. The 28th of July, the bishop was called and summoned to appear, but appeared not; and so was pronounced *contumax*. But at another meeting he sent Dr. Cap, his proctor, by whom he made a protestation against their doings and jurisdiction; and that it was not decent for that reverend father to appear before him, the archbishop's official.[2] However, at another meeting, the bishop not appearing at the time and place appointed, Dr. May declared him obstinate, and to incur the penalty of obstinacy. After this the bishop, by his proctor, was willing to submit to obey law, and to stand to the command of the Church, and to do penance for his said contumacy, to be enjoined by the archbishop, or his commissary. At another court the bishop appeared in person, and then showed himself willing to take the said commissary for visitor, or any other in the name of the archbishop of Canterbury. This bishop was now fourscore years old, and blind, as appears by a writing of his sent by his proctor, dated September 1534. He died two years after, and came in to be bishop in the year 1500.

---

[1] [Catalogue of the Bishops of England, p. 354.]

[2] Cranmer's Reg.

This bishop seems to have made himself very odious in his diocese by his fierceness and rigours against such as were willing to be better informed in religion: whom he would style men "savouring of the frying-pan." He seized such books as were brought from beyond sea, of which sort there were now many, which tended to lay open the corruptions of the Church; and especially the New Testament, which he could not endure should be read. And when some of these commonly gave out, that it was the king's pleasure that such books should be read, he sent up studiously, by the abbot of Hyde, to have this showed to the king; and begged his letters under his seal, to be directed to him, or anybody else whom the king pleased in his diocese, to declare it was not his pleasure such books should be among his subjects, and to punish such as reported it was. He sent also a letter to Warham, then archbishop of Canterbury, making his complaint and information to him, desiring him to send for the said abbot, who should tell him what his thoughts were for the suppression of these men; and entreating the archbishop to inform the king against these erroneous men, as he called them. Some part of his diocese was bounded with the sea, and Ipswich and Yarmouth, and other places of considerable traffic, were under his jurisdiction. And so there happened many merchants and mariners, who, by converse from abroad, had received knowledge of the truth, and brought in divers good books. This mightily angered the zealous bishop, and he used all the severity he could to stop the progress of evangelical truth, and wished for more authority from the king to punish it; for his opinion was, that if they continued any time, he thought they would undo them all, as he wrote to the archbishop. This letter is in the Appendix.[1]

Bishops consecrated.

April the 19th, the archbishop of Canterbury, invested in his pontificals, consecrated Thomas Goodrick, doctor of decrees, bishop of Ely, in his chapel at Croydon; together with Rowland Lee, doctor of law, bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; and John Salcot, alias Capon, doctor of law, bishop of Bangor: being assisted by John, bishop of Lincoln, and Christopher, bishop of Sidon.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Archbishop preacheth at Canterbury.

In order to the bettering the state of religion in the nation, the archbishop's endeavours, both with the king and the clergy, were not wanting from time to time. And something soon after fell out which afforded him a fair opportunity, which was this. The king, resolving to vindicate his own right of supremacy against the encroachments of popes in his dominions, especially now the Parliament had restored it to him, being at Winchester, sent for his bishops thither about Michaelmas, ordering them to go down to their respective dioceses, and there, in their own persons, to preach up the regal authority, and to explain to the people the reason of excluding the pope from all jurisdiction in these realms. Our archbishop, according to this command, speeds down into his diocese to promote this service for the king and the Church too. He went not into the nearer parts of Kent, about Otford and Knol, where his most frequent residence used to be; because his influence had a good effect for the instruction of the people thereabouts in this, as well as in other points of sound religion; but he repaired into the east parts of his diocese, where he preached up and down upon the two articles of the pope's usurpations and the king's supremacy. But the people of Canterbury being less persuaded of these points than all his diocese besides, there, in his cathedral church, he preached two sermons; wherein he insisted upon three things:—

---

[1] No. XII.

I. That the bishop of Rome was not God's vicar upon earth, as he was taken. Here he declared by what crafts the bishop of Rome had obtained his usurped authority.

II. That the holiness that see so much boasted of, and by which name popes affected to be styled, was but a holiness in name, and that there was no such holiness at Rome. And here he launched out into the vices and profligate kind of living there.

III. He inveighed against the bishop of Rome's laws, which were miscalled *divinæ leges*, and *sacri canones.* He said, that those of his laws which were good, the king had commanded to be observed; and so they were to be kept out of obedience to him. And here he descended to speak of the ceremonies of the Church, that they ought not to be rejected, nor yet to be observed with an opinion, that of themselves they make men holy, or remit their sins,—seeing our sins are remitted by the death of our Saviour Christ: but that they were observed for a common commodity, and for good order and quietness, as the common laws of the kingdom were. And for this cause, ceremonies were instituted in the Church, and for a remembrance of many good things, as the king's laws dispose men unto justice and unto peace. And, therefore, he made it a general rule, that ceremonies were to be observed as the laws of the land were.

These sermons of the archbishop, it seems, as they were new doctrines to them, so they were received by them at first with much gladness. But the friars did not at all like these discourses; they thought such doctrines laid open the truth too much, and might prove prejudicial unto their gains. And, therefore, by a combination among themselves, they thought it convenient that the archbishop's sermons should be by some of their party confuted, and in the same place where he preached them. So, soon after came up the prior of the Black Friars in Canterbury, levelling his discourse against the three things that the archbishop had preached. He asserted the Church of Christ never erred; that he would not slander the bishops of Rome; and that the laws of the Church were equal with the laws of God.

This angry prior also told the archbishop to his face, in a good audience, concerning what he had preached of the bishop of Rome's vices, that he knew no vices by none of the bishops of Rome. And, whereas, the archbishop had said in his sermon to the people, that he had prayed many years that we might be separated from that see, and that he might see the power of Rome destroyed, because it wrought so many things contrary to the honour of God, and the wealth of the realm, and because he saw no hopes of amendment; for this the prior cried out against him, that he preached uncharitably.

The archbishop, not suffering his authority to be thus affronted, nor the king's service to be thus hindered, convented the prior before him before Christmas. At his first examination, he denied that he preached against the archbishop, and confessed that his grace had not preached any thing amiss; but sometime afterward, being got free from the mild archbishop, and being secretly upheld by some persons in the combination, he then said, he had preached amiss in many things, and that he purposely preached against him. This created the archbishop abundance of slander in those parts. The business came to the king's ears, who seemed to require the archbishop to censure him in his own court.

But upon occasion of this, the archbishop wrote his whole cause in a letter to the king, dated from his house at Ford, 1535, declaring what he had preached, and what the other had preached in contradiction to him. And withal entreated his majesty that he, the archbishop, might not have the judging of him, lest he might seem partial; but that he would commit the hearing unto the lord privy seal, who was Crumwel, or else to assign unto him other persons, whom his majesty pleased, that the cause might be jointly heard together. He appealed to the king and his council, "If the prior did not defend the bishop of Rome, though he had said nothing else, than that the Church never erred. For then they were no errors, as he inferred, that were taught of the pope's power; and that he was Christ's vicar in earth, and by God's law head of all the world, spiritual and temporal; and that all people must believe that *de necessitate salutis;* and that whosoever did anything against the see of Rome is an heretic. But if these be no errors, then your grace's laws, said he, be erroneous, that pronounce the bishop of Rome to be of no more power than other bishops, and them to be traitors that defend the contrary." In fine, in the stomach of an archbishop, and finding it necessary to put a stop to the ill designs of these friars, he concluded, "That if that man who had so highly offended the king, and openly preached against him, being his ordinary and metropolitan of the province, and that in such matters as concerned the authority, misliving, and laws of the bishop of Rome, and that also within his own church: if he were not looked upon, he left it to the king's prudence to expend, what example it might prove unto others, with like colour to maintain the bishop of Rome's authority; and of what estimation he (the archbishop) should be reputed hereafter, and what credence would be given unto his preaching for time to come." And he left his majesty to hear the testimony of Dr. Leighton, one of the king's visitors, who was present at the sermon the archbishop then made. This letter, the contents whereof I have now set down, I have placed in the Appendix,[1] as well worthy the preserving among the rest of the monuments of this archbishop, as I transcribed it out of the Cotton library. I do not find what issue this business had, but I suspect the Black Friars of Canterbury had a black mark set upon them by the king for this opposition of his archbishop, in the discharge of his commands.

But to speak a little of a provincial visitation, *jure metropolitico*, which the archbishop had begun the last year, viz. 1534, being his first visitation. It was somewhat extraordinary, for such a visitation had not been in an hundred years before. For this he got the king's license to countenance his doings, knowing what oppositions he should meet with. In the month of May, we find him at his house at Otford about this business, the main end whereof was to promote the king's supremacy, and, as opportunity served, to correct the superstitions of this Church, and to inspect even bishops and cathedrals themselves.

In April 1535, Cranmer had sent his monition to Stephen

---

[1] No. XIII.

Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, that he would visit his diocese. The bishop, who never loved the archbishop, and being a great upholder of the old popish superstitions, was the more jealous of this visitation, opposing himself as much as he could against it, and would have picked an hole in Cranmer's coat, for styling himself, in the instrument of the process, *Totius Angliæ Primas:* as though this had been an high reflection upon the king, and detracted much from his supremacy. Of this, therefore, he went and made a complaint to the king himself; and, taking it in some indignation that the archbishop should visit his diocese, he pretended to the king that the clergy of his diocese would be driven to great straits, and mightily oppressed, if it should be now visited again, having been visited but five years ago by his predecessor Warham, especially being also to pay a new duty, enjoined by the Parliament, namely, their tenths,—hoping hereby to evade the archbishop's inspection into the corruptions of the diocese of Winchester.

All this Crumwel, his friend, certified him of by his chaplain, one Champion. Winchester, indeed, whatsoever he pretended, tendered not so much the king's cause as his own, that he might not be visited. For otherwise he would have complained to the king of this matter before Cranmer's signification to him of a visitation, since he always bare the title of primate of all England, as being the common style of the archbishop. And if this style of primacy was a diminution to the king, it would have been so to the pope, when Winchester held him, as he did once, for supreme head of the Church; but then he never made any complaint against those archbishops that styled themselves primates. The pope's supreme authority was not less thought of because he had such primates under him, but rather more. And the king might therefore have such as were primates under him, without any derogation to his authority. Nor did Cranmer value at all names and titles; and if he thought it anything interfering with the king's honour, he would himself have been the first to sue for the taking it wholly away. This he signified in a letter to Secretary Crumwel, which, because it hath many excellent things declarative of the good temper and spirit of Cranmer, I have presented it to the reader's eye in the Appendix, being an original in the Cotton library.[1]

And as Winchester had picked a quarrel with him for one part of his archiepisopal style, so Stokesly, bishop of London, a man of the same inveterate temper against Cranmer, refused his visitation, because he styled himself in his monitions, *Apostolicæ Sedis Legatus.* For under that title he convented that bishop, with the abbots, priors, and archdeacon of London, to appear before him at a visitation, which he intended to hold at the chapter-house in St. Paul's Church, London. But the bishop of London and the chapter warned him of assuming that title, as making against the king's prerogative. And at the visitation itself in St. Paul's, they made a protestation, which was openly read; the import whereof was, that they would not accept him as such a legate, and neither admit nor submit to his visitation under that name, and required the archbishop's register to enter their protestation; and, upon his refusal thereof, delivered a certificate of what they had done. Stokesly also contended with him for suspending all the jurisdiction of the bishop, dean, and archdeacon, during his visitation; to which the archbishop answered, it was no more than his predecessors had usually done in those cases. In fine, they appealed, in their own justification, unto the king, and desired his license to defend themselves against him by the laws, and as the Parliament had provided. Thus they showed before their secret malice and violent opposition against the good archbishop, and how afraid they were of his visitation, glad to catch anything to enervate his authority. The sum of which appeal, drawn up by Stokesly, being somewhat too long to be subjoined here, may be read in the Appendix.[2]

Finally, upon the archbishop's visiting of his diocese, he entered three protestations against it (as may appear in Stokesly's register), for preserving his privileges.

This man ever carried himself perversely to the archbishop. It was not long after this time, that the archbishop, whose mind ran very much upon bringing in the free use of the Holy Scripture in English among the people, put on

[1] No. XIV.

[2] No. XV.

vigorously a translation of it. And, that it might not come to be prohibited, as it had been, upon pretence of the ignorance or unfaithfulness of the translators, he proceeded in this method.[1] First, he began with the translation of the New Testament, taking an old English translation thereof, which he divided into nine or ten parts; causing each part to be written at large in a paper book, and then to be sent to the best learned bishops and others, to the intent they should make a perfect correction thereof. And when they had done, he required them to send back their parts, so corrected, unto him at Lambeth, by a day limited for that purpose; and the same course, no question, he took with the Old Testament. It chanced that the Acts of the Apostles were sent to Bishop Stokesly to oversee and correct. When the day came, every man had sent to Lambeth their parts corrected, only Stokesly's portion was wanting. My lord of Canterbury wrote to the bishop a letter for his part, requiring him to deliver them unto the bringer, his secretary. He received the archbishop's letter at Fulham, unto which he made this answer:—"I marvel what my lord of Canterbury meaneth, that thus abuseth the people in giving them liberty to read the Scriptures, which doth nothing else but infect them with heresy. I have bestowed never an hour upon my portion, nor never will. And therefore my lord shall have this book again, for I will never be guilty of bringing the simple people into error." My lord of Canterbury's servant took the book, and brought the same to Lambeth unto my lord, declaring my lord of London's answer. When the archbishop had perceived that the bishop had done nothing therein, "I marvel," said he, "that my lord of London is so froward that he will not do as other men do." One Mr. Thomas Lawney stood by; and, hearing my lord speak so much of the bishop's untowardness, said, I can tell your grace why my lord of London will not bestow any labour or pains this way. Your grace knoweth well that his portion is a piece of New Testament. But he, being persuaded that Christ had bequeathed him nothing in his Testament, thought it mere madness to bestow any labour or pain where no gain was to be gotten. And besides this, it is the Acts of the Apostles, which were simple poor fellows, and therefore my lord of London disdained to have to do with any of them. Whereat my lord of Canterbury, and others that stood by, could not forbear from laughter.

---

[1] Foxii MS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxxii. 87].

This Lawney was a witty man, and chaplain to the old duke of Norfolk, and had been one of the scholars placed by the cardinal in his new college at Oxon, where he was chaplain of the house, and prisoner there with Frith, another of the scholars. In the time of the Six Articles he was a minister in Kent, placed there, I suppose, by the archbishop. When that severe act was passed, more by the authority of a Parliament than by the authority of the word of God, it chanced that my lord of Norfolk, meeting with this his chaplain, said, O, my Lawney (knowing him of old much to favour priests' matrimony), whether may priests now have wives or no? If it please your grace, replied he, I cannot well tell whether priests may have wives or no; but well I wot, and am sure of it, for all your act, that wives will have priests. Hearken, masters, said the duke, how this knave scorneth our act, and maketh it not worth a fly. Well, I see by it that thou wilt never forget thy old tricks. And so the duke, and such gentlemen as were with him, went away merrily, laughing at Lawney's sudden and apt answer. The reader will excuse this digression.

CHAPTER IX.

Monasteries Visited.

This year the monasteries were visited by Crumwel, chief visitor, who appointed Leighton, Legh, Petre, London, his deputies, with injunctions given them to be observed in their visitation. Indeed, the king now had thoughts of dissolving them, as well as visiting them, whose ends herein were, partly because he saw the monks and friars so untoward towards him, and so bent to the pope, and partly to enrich himself with the spoils. Archbishop Cranmer is said also to have counselled and pressed the king to it; but for other ends, viz. That out of the revenues of these monasteries the king might found more bishoprics; and that dioceses being reduced into less compass, the diocesans might the better discharge their office, according to the Scripture and primitive rules; and because the archbishop saw how inconsistent these foundations were with the reformation of religion; purgatory, masses, pilgrimages, worship of saints and images, being effectual to their constitution, as the bishop of Sarum hath observed.[1] And the archbishop hoped that from these ruins there would be new foundations in every cathedral erected to be nurseries of learning for the use of the whole diocese. But however short our archbishop fell of his ends, desired and hoped for by these dissolutions, the king obtained his. For the vast riches that the religious houses brought in to the king may be guessed by what was found in one, namely, St. Swithin's, Winchester; an account of the treasures whereof I having once observed from a manuscript in the Benet library, thought not amiss here to lay before the reader; which he may find in the Appendix.[2]

When these visitors returned home from their visitation, they came well stocked with informations of the loose, wicked, and abominable lives and irregularities of the chief members of these houses of religion, having by diligent inquisition throughout all England collected them. These enormities were read publicly in the Parliament house, being brought in by the visitors. When they were first read, nothing was done with these unclean abbots and priors: "But within a while," saith Latimer, in a sermon before King Edward, "how bad soever the reports of them were, some of them were made bishops, and others put into good dignities in the Church; that so the king might save their pensions, which were otherwise to be paid them."[3]

Now I will, at the conclusion of my collections for this year, set down the names of the bishops this year consecrated, both diocesan and suffragan; there having been an act of Parliament made in the six and twentieth of the king (that is, the last year) for furnishing the dioceses with six and twenty suffragans, for the better aid and comfort of the diocesans; the sees whereof are all set down in the said act.[1] But I doubt whether there were ever so many made. At least the mention of the acts of the consecration of some of the suffragans in the province of Canterbury are omitted in the Register.

---

[1] Hist. Ref. part i. pp. 189, 190, [vol. i. p. 382].

[2] No. XVI. Note, that the dissolution of St. Swithin's, in Winchester (though laid here under the year 1535), happened not that year, but about five years after, viz. 1540. But the occasion of the discourse there, which was of the vast wealth obtained by the king by the fall of religious houses, made the author produce it in this place, as an instance thereof.—*From the Errata and Emendations to the first Edition.*

[3] [See Parker Society edition of Bishop Latimer's Sermons, p. 123].

Before this act of Parliament enjoining the number of suffragans, suffragans were not unusual in the realm. Whom the bishops diocesan, either for their own ease, or because of their necessary absence from their dioceses in embassies abroad, or attendance upon the court, or civil affairs, procured to be consecrated to reside in their steads. Thus to give some instances of them, as I have met with them. About the year 1531, I find one Underwood, suffragan in Norwich, that degraded Bilney before his martyrdom.[2] Certain, bearing the title of bishops of Sidon, assisted the archbishops of Canterbury. One of these was named Thomas Wellys, prior of St. Gregory's by Canterbury; he being Archbishop Warham's chaplain, was sent by him to Cardinal Wolsey, to expostulate with him in his lord's name for encroaching upon his prerogative court. There was afterwards one Christopher that bore that title, and assisted Archbishop Cranmer about these times in ordinations; and another Thomas, entitled also of Sidon, succeeded. Long before these, I find one William Bottlesham Episcopus Navatensis, anno 1382, at the convocation house in London, summoned against the Wicklivites, that then showed themselves at Oxford. Robert King, abbot of Oseney, while abbot, was consecrated titular bishop, and called Episcopus Roannensis, a see in the province of the archbishopric of Athens.[3] This is he that resigned Oseney and Tame under the name of bishop of Reonen, of which see the bishop of Sarum was at a stand.[1] He was translated from this imaginary bishopric to be bishop of Oxford, in the year 1541. One John Hatton had the title of Episcopus Negropont; he was suffragan under the archbishop of York. John Thornden, who was several times commissary of Oxon, while Archbishop Warham was chancellor of that university, was styled Episcopus Syrinensis.[2] And hereafter, in the progress of this book, we shall meet with a bishop of Hippolitanum, who assisted Archbishop Cranmer at his ordinations. These were but titulary bishops; and the use of them was, to supply the diocesans' absence, to consecrate churches and churchyards, and to reconcile them, to assist at ordinations, and confer orders, to confirm children, and the like.

---

[1] [The following are the several sees named in the Act, 26 Hen. VIII. cap. 14 :—Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leicester, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Bristowe, Penrith, Bridgewater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Perth, Berwick, St. Germain's, in Cornwall, and the Isle of Wight.]

[2] [See Fox's Acts and Mon. vol. iv. p. 652.]

[3] Ex. Regist. Archbishop Courteney.

Sometimes these suffragans had no titles at all to any place, but were bishops at large. Such an one, named Richard Martin, is met with in an old register at Canterbury, who was guardian of the Gray Friars there. By his last will, made 1498, he gave a library to the church and convent. He was parson of Ickham, and vicar of Lyd in Kent; and writ himself in the said will Bishop of the universal church; by which the antiquarian supposed nothing else was meant, but that he was a bishop in name, endued with orders, but not with jurisdiction episcopal, having no particular charge to intend, but generally officiating as bishop in any part of the Christian Church.[3] This I have writ, that the reader may not be put to a stand when he shall, in these commentaries, meet with some of these titular bishops.

But proceed we now to the bishops that were this year consecrated.

Diocesan Bishops.[4]

April the 11th, Nicholas Shaxton was consecrated bishop of Sarum, in the king's chapel of St. Stephen, by our archbishop, John bishop of Lincoln, and Christopher Sidoniens, assisting.

---

[1] Hist. Ref. Coll. p. 148 [vol. i. part. 2, p. 234]; Godwin's Catal. [pp. 404, 405].

[2] [Wood's] Ath. Oxonien. [vol. ii. 40].

[3] Somner's Antiq. of Cant. [p. 105].

[4] Among the diocesan bishops consecrated under the year 1535, place Hugh Latimer, consecrated bishop of Worcester, and John

September the 15th was the act of confirmation and election of Edward Fox, elect of Hereford, and of William Barlow, prior of the priory of canons regular of Bisham, of the order of St. Augustin Sarum, for the bishopric of St. Asaph. The consecration of these two last are not inserted in the Register.

March the 18th, the act of confirmation and election of George Brown, D.D. provincial of the order of Friars Augustin in the city of London, for the archbishopric of Dublin. Consecrated March the 19th, by the archbishop at Lambeth, Nicholas bishop of Sarum, and John bishop of Rochester, assisting.

Of this last-mentioned bishop I shall take some further notice, having been the first Protestant bishop in Ireland, as Cranmer was in England; a great furtherer of the Reformation in that land, being a stirring man, and of good parts and confidence.[1] He was first taken notice of by Crumwel, lord privy seal, and by his sole means preferred to this dignity in the church of Ireland; upon the observation that was taken of him, when he was provincial of the Augustin order in England, advising all people to make their application only to Christ, and not to saints; whereby he was recommended unto King Henry, who much favoured him. When the king's supremacy was to be brought in and recognised in Ireland, which was the same year wherein he was archbishop, he was appointed one of the king's commissioners for the procuring the nobility, gentry and clergy, to reject the pope, and to own the king for supreme

Hildesly, or Hilsey, a friar of the order of Preachers, first of Bristow, and afterwards of Oxford, consecrated bishop of Rochester next after John Fisher, executed for treason. These two I had omitted in their places, not meeting with them in Cranmer's Register. The former, I suppose, was consecrated with Shaxton in April, as the latter might be with Fox and Barlow in September, his temporalities having been restored to him in the beginning of October. This Hilsey was a great assistant to Archbishop Cranmer, and a learned man. He wrote a book of prayers, with epistles and gospels (in English, I suppose), which he dedicated to the Lord Crumwel; by whose command it was published.—*From the Errata and Emendations to the first Edition.*

[1] Life and Death of George Brown, printed in Dublin [in the year 1681, p. 2].

head of the Church. In which commission he acted with that diligence, that it was to the hazard of his life; such opposition was made to it in that realm. At which time, in an assembly of the clergy, George Dowdal, archbishop of Armagh, made a speech to them, and laid a curse upon those, whosoever they were, that should own the king's supremacy. Within five years after this, this Archbishop Brown caused all superstitious relics and images to be removed out of the two cathedrals in Dublin, and out of the rest of the churches in his diocese; and ordered the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, to be set up in frames above the altar in Christ's Church, Dublin. In King Edward VI.'s reign, he received the English Common Prayer Book into that realm upon the king's proclamation for that purpose, after much opposition by Dowdal; and it was read in Christ's Church, Dublin, on Easter-day, 1551. He preached also a sermon in Christ's Church for having the Scripture in the mother tongue, and against image worship; and for this his forwardness and conformity in religion, and the perverseness of the other archbishop of Armagh, who had violently resisted all good proceedings, the title of primacy was taken from him, and conferred upon the archbishop of Dublin; and Dowdal was banished, or as others say, voluntarily left his bishopric. And then Goodacre, sent from England with Bale for the see of Ossory, succeeded. In Queen Mary's days, Dowdal was restored; and being a great man in this reign, expulsed Archbishop Brown from his see for being a married man; and two or three years after was succeeded by Hugh Corwin (a complier in all reigns), and Brown soon after died.

Suffragan Bishops.

The first of these standing in the Register of the archbishop was the suffragan of the see of Ipswich. The bishop of Norwich, according to the direction of the late act (wherein the bishop was to nominate two for suffragan to the king, and the king was to name one of them to the archbishop, to receive consecration),[1] humbly signified to the king, that he was destitute of the aid of a suffragan; and so prayed him to appoint either George, abbot of the monastery of St. Mary's of Leyston, or Thomas Mannyng, prior of the monastery of St. Mary's of Butley, to be his suffragan: without mentioning for what place. And on the 7th of March, in the 27th of his reign, he sent to the archbishop to make the latter suffragan of Gipwich [Ipswich]: who was accordingly consecrated by the archbishop, and invested *in insigniis episcopalibus;* Nicholas bishop of Sarum, and John bishop of Rochester, assisting. The date not specified; but probably on the same day with the consecration following, there being the same assistants.

---

[1] Regist. Cran.

The said bishop of Norwich sent to the king, recommending to him to be suffragan Thomas de Castleacre, of the Cluniac order, and John Salisbury, prior of St. Faith's of Horsham, of the order of St. Benet, both priors of monasteries in Norwich diocese. The king sent to the archbishop to consecrate John, the prior of St. Faith's, for suffragan of Thetford. Accordingly he consecrated him March the 19th, Nicholas [Shaxton] bishop of Sarum, and John [Hilsey] bishop of Rochester, assisting.

CHAPTER X.

The Audience Court.

The good archbishop almost every year met with new opposition from the popish clergy. The late act for abolishing the pope's authority, and some acts before that, for restraining of applications to Rome, served them now as a colour to strike at one of the archbishop's courts, viz. that of the audience (a court which the archbishops used to hold in their own houses, where they received causes, complaints, and appeals, and had learned civilians living with them, that were auditors of the said causes, before the archbishop gave sentence); pretending that he held it as the pope's legate; urging also the great troubles and inconveniences it caused, both to the clergy and the laity; and that every man must, by virtue of that court, be forced up to London, from the farthest part of the land, for a slanderous word, or a trifle. And that they thought it convenient, if it were the king's pleasure to continue that court, that he would settle it upon some other, and not upon the archbishop, that so it might appear the original of that court was from the king, and not from the pope. And lastly, that it would not be safe to constitute the archbishop the pope's legate, because it would infringe the power of the vicar-general. This was drawn up in way of petition and complaint, either to the king or Parliament, by a combination of some of the convocation, as I suspect; the paper being writ by the hand of the register of the lower house of convocation. The great wheel, we may be sure, that set a moving this device, was Winchester [Gardner] his never-failing adversary.

The king, notwithstanding, bade the archbishop maintain his court. And he answered all their pleas against it; and by way of protestation affirmed, that he kept not his court by virtue of his bull from Rome for legate, and that none could suspect that he did: and that he saw no cause but that he might keep that court by virtue of the late act of Parliament, that gave power to enjoy all things that were before had from the see of Rome. And finally, he answered, that it was the king's will and command that he should continue his court. To which the convocation, or rather some part of it, made a reply, that may be seen in the Appendix.[1]

But notwithstanding these discouragements (which were thrown in probably to hinder his good designs), the archbishop vigorously prosecuted a reformation at this convocation; where, assisted by Crumwel, the king's vicar-general, he earnestly laboured for the redress of several abuses and errors in the English Church. And that not without good success at length: for, after much deliberation among the clergy there assembled, and much opposition too, he got a book of divers good articles to that purpose to be agreed upon and subscribed. An account of which by-and-by shall follow.

---

[1] No. XVII.

CHAPTER XI.

Articles of Religion.

Now though I do not find the king went so far as that it should be enjoined on all the clergy to own the articles of this book by their own hands subscribed, yet he published and recommended them to all his loving subjects in general, to accept and repute them to be agreeable to God's laws, and proper for the establishment of peace and concord; and further probably in prudence the king thought not fit yet to go, considering the great disputes and arguments that had happened in the convocation hereupon. Now because this was one of the great services our pious prelate contributed to the Church, and was one of the first steps made in the reformation of the doctrine and worship, it will not be amiss here, in order to the enlightening this history, to set down the heads of this book, though it be done by others before me. And notwithstanding what the noble author of the history of Henry VIII. saith,[1] he gathered by some records, that this book was devised by the king himself, and recommended afterwards to the convocation by Crumwel, yet we have reason to attribute a great share therein to the archbishop.

They that are minded to see a draught of these articles from the original, with the royal assent prefixed to them, may have it in Dr. Fuller's Church History,[2] which, he tells us, he transcribed out of the acts of the convocation. The bishop of Sarum also met with an original of them in the Cotton library,[3] wrote out fairly, as it seems, for the king's own use, and subscribed with all the hands of the convocation thereunto. He also hath inserted the transcript of them in the first part of his History of the Reformation.[4]

In the rebellion in the north, which happened this year, 1536, chiefly raised by priests and friars, many copies of these articles (for the book was printed by Barthelet) did Crumwel send, by the king's order, to the duke of Norfolk, the king's lieutenant there, to disperse in those parts, together with the original copy itself, as it was signed by the hands of the convocation, amounting to the number of 116 bishops, abbots, priors, archdeacons, and proctors of the clergy. Which the said duke had order to show unto the clergy and others, as occasion served; that they might understand it was a proper act of the Church, and no innovation of the king and a few of his counsellors, as they gave out. And, after he had made his use of this original, he was required to reserve it safe for the king. This choice treasure, which the king himself required such care to be taken of, Sir Robert Cotton afterwards procured, at his no small expense, no doubt. It is very fairly written in vellum; and at the bottom of the first page is written, *Robertus Cotton Bruceus*, by Sir Robert's own hand, signifying his value of this monument. It is still extant in that incomparable library in the volume Cleopatra E. 5: and there I have seen it, and diligently compared it. Excuse this digression, and I now proceed to the articles themselves.

---

[1] [Lord Herbert's] Life Henry VIII. p. 466.

[2] [Vol. iii. pp. 140—159, Oxford editon, 1845.]

[3] [Cotton MSS. Cleop. E. v. 59.]

[4] Addenda to the Collection, num. 1. [vol. i. part 2, num. 1. p. 459].

These articles were of two sorts, some concerning faith, and some concerning ceremonies.

The former sort were digested under these five titles following:—

I. *The principal Articles of Faith.*—And they were these. "That all those things that be comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible, and in the three creeds, are true, and constantly to be believed. That we take and hold the same for the most holy and infallible words of God. That the articles of the faith, contained in the creeds, are necessary to be believed for man's salvation. That the same words be kept, in which the articles of faith are conceived. That all opinions contrary to the articles, and which were condemned in the four first councils, are to be utterly refused."

II. *The Sacrament of Baptism.*—"That it was instituted and ordained by Jesus Christ as necessary to everlasting life. That by it all, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God offered them. That infants and innocents must be baptized, because the promise of grace and everlasting life pertains as well to them as to those who have the use of reason; and that therefore baptized infants shall undoubtedly be saved. That they are to be baptized because of original sin, which is remitted only by baptism. That they that are once baptized must not be baptized again. That the opinions of Anabaptists and Pelagians are to be held for detestable heresies. That those who, having the use of reason, shall come to baptism, shall obtain the remission of all their sins, if they come thereunto perfectly and truly repentant, confessing and believing all the articles of the faith, and having firm credence and trust in the promise of God adjoined to the said sacrament."

III. *The Sacrament of Penance.*—" That that sacrament was instituted of Christ in the New Testament, as a thing so necessary to man's salvation, that no man that after his baptism is fallen again, and hath committed deadly sin, can, without the same, be saved. That such penitents shall without doubt attain remission of their sins. That this sacrament consists of contrition, confession, and amendment of life. That contrition consists, first, of acknowledgment of our sins, unto which the penitent is brought by hearing and considering the will of God declared in his laws, and feeling in his own conscience that God is angry, and this joined with sorrow and shame, and fear of God's displeasure. That, secondly, it consists of faith, trust, and confidence in the mercies and goodness of God, whereby the penitent must conceive certain hope, and repute himself justified, not for any merit or work done by him, but by the only merits of the blood of Jesus Christ. That this faith is begotten and confirmed by the application of Christ's words and promises. That confession to a priest, the second part of penance, is necessary, where it may be had. That the absolution given by the priest was instituted of Christ, to apply the promises of God's grace to the penitent. And that the words of absolution pronounced by the priest, are spoken by the authority given him by Christ. That men must give no less faith and credence to the words of absolution pronounced by the ministers of the Church, than they would give unto the very words and voice of God himself. And that men in no wise contemn this auricular confession. As to the third part of penance, viz. amendment of life, that all are bound to bring forth the fruits of penance, that is to say, prayer, fasting, and almsdeeds, and to make restitution and satisfaction in will and deed to their neighbour, and all other good works, or else they shall never be saved. That works of charity be necessary to salvation. That by penance and such good works we do not only obtain everlasting life, but deserve remission or mitigation of these present pains and affliction in this world." Mark here, by the way, how the doctrine of merits is propounded; our merits do not extend to pardon and everlasting life, but only to the removal or abatement of temporal afflictions.

IV. *The Sacrament of the Altar.*—"That under the form and figure of bread and wine is verily and substantially contained that very same body and blood which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross. And that the selfsame body and blood of Christ is distributed unto, and received by, all the communicants. That therefore this sacrament is to be used with all due reverence and honour. And that before any receive it, he ought religiously to try and search his own conscience."

V. *Justification.*—"That the word signifies remission of sins, and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God. That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith, joined with charity. That neither our contrition and faith, nor any work proceeding thence, can merit or deserve the said justification. That the mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely for Christ's sake, and the merit of his blood and passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof."

This was the sum of the articles concerning faith. Those concerning ceremonies followed next; which were likewise comprised under five titles.

I. *Of Images.*—"That they be representers of virtue and good example. That they be stirrers of men's minds, and make them often to remember and lament their sins, especially the images of Christ and our Lady. That it was meet they should stand in the churches, but be none otherwise esteemed. That the bishops and preachers diligently teach the people according to this doctrine, lest there might fortune idolatry to ensue. That they be taught also that censing, kneeling, and offering to images, be by no means to be done (although the same had entered by devotion, and fallen to custom), but only to God and in his honour, though it be done before the images."

II. *Of honouring Saints.*—"That they are to be honoured, but not with that confidence and honour that is due only unto God, trusting to attain at their hands that which must be had only of God. That most especially Christ is to be lauded and praised in them for their excellent virtues, which he planted in them, and for their good example. And that they are to be taken, when they may, to be the advancers of our prayers and demands unto Christ."

III. *Of praying to Saints.*—"That though grace and remission of sins be to be obtained only of God, by the mediation of Christ; yet it is very laudable to pray to saints in heaven to be intercessors, and to pray for us and with us unto God, after this manner:—'All holy angels and saints in heaven, pray for us and with us unto the Father, that for his dear Son Jesus Christ's sake, we may have grace of him, and remission of our sins, with an earnest purpose (not wanting in ghostly strength), to observe and keep his holy commandments, and never to decline from the same again unto our lives' end.' That in this manner we may pray to our blessed Lady, Saint John Baptist, or any other saint particularly, so that it be done without any vain superstition, as to think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ; or that any saint does serve for one thing more than another. That holy-days are to be kept to God, in memory of him and his saints, upon such days as the Church hath ordained, but may be mitigated and moderated by the king, being supreme head."

IV. *Of Rites and Ceremonies.*—"As vestments in God's service, sprinkling holy water, giving holy bread, bearing candles on Candlemas-day, giving of ashes on Ash-Wednesday, bearing of palms on Palm-Sunday, creeping to the cross, and kissing it, and offering unto Christ before the same on Good Friday; setting up the sepulchre of Christ, hallowing of the font, and other like exorcisms and benedictions, and laudable customs; that these are not to be contemned and cast away, but continued, to put us in remembrance of spiritual things; but that none of these ceremonies have power to remit sin."

V. *Of Purgatory.* — "That Christians are to pray for souls departed, and to commit them in their prayers to God's mercy, and cause others to pray for them in masses and exequies, and to give alms to others to pray for them, that they may be relieved and holpen of some part of their pain. But because the place where they be, the name thereof, and kinds of pain there, is to us uncertain by Scripture, therefore we remit this, with all other things, to Almighty God, under whose mercies it is meet to commend them. That such abuses be put away, which, under the name of purgatory have been advanced, as to make men believe that, through the bishop of Rome's pardons, souls might clearly be delivered out of purgatory, and the pains of it; or that masses said at *scala cœli*, or otherwise, in any place, or before any image, might deliver them from all their pains, and send them straight to heaven."

These are the contents of that memorable book of articles. There are reasons added now and then to confirm the respective tenets there laid down, and many quotations of Holy Scripture, which, for brevity sake, I have omitted, which one may conjecture to have been inserted by the pen of the archbishop, who was the great introducer of this practice, of proving or confuting opinions in religion by the word of God, instead of the ordinary custom then used, of doing it by schoolmen and popish canons. We find, indeed, many popish errors here mixed with evangelical truths, which must either be attributed to the defectiveness of our prelate's knowledge as yet in true religion, or being the principles and opinions of the king, or both. Let not any be offended herewith, but let him rather take notice what a great deal of Gospel doctrine here came to light; and not only so, but was owned and propounded by authority to be believed and practised. The sun of truth was now but rising, and breaking through the thick mists of that idolatry, superstition, and ignorance, that had so long prevailed in this nation, and the rest of the world, and was not yet advanced to its meridian brightness.

CHAPTER XII.

Cranmer's Judgment about some Cases of Matrimony.

In this year there came forth two remarkable books, whereof both the king, and the archbishop and bishops, might be said to be joint composers, inasmuch as they seemed to be devised by the archbishop, and some of the bishops, and then revised, noted, corrected, and enlarged by the king.

The one of these was the book of articles of religion, mentioned before. This book bore this title, "Articles devised by the king's highness to stable Christian quietness and unity among the people," &c., with a preface by the king, where the king saith he was constrained to put his own pen to the book, and to conceive certain articles, which words I leave to the conjecture of the reader, whether by them he be inclined to think that the king were the first writer of them, or that, being writ and composed by another, they were perused, considered, corrected, and augmented by his pen.

The other book that came out this year was occasioned by a piece published by Reginald Pole, intituled, "De Unione Ecclesiastica,"[1] which inveighing much against the king for assuming the supremacy, and extolling the pope unmeasurably, he employed the archbishop, and some other bishops, to compile a treatise, showing the usurpations of popes, and how late it was ere they took this superiority upon them, some hundred years passing before they did it; and that all bishops were limited to their own dioceses by one of the eight councils, to which every pope did swear; and how the papal authority was first derived from the emperor, and not from Christ. For this there were good arguments taken from the Scriptures and the Fathers. The book was signed by both the archbishops, and nineteen other bishops. It was called the bishops' book, because devised by them.[2]

The Lord Crumwel did use to consult with the archbishop in all his ecclesiastical matters. And there happened now, while the archbishop was at Ford, a great case of marriage, whom it concerned I cannot tell,[1] but the king was desirous to be resolved about it by the archbishop, and commanded Crumwel to send to him for his judgment therein. The case was threefold.

---

[1] [See p. 9.]

[2] Herbert's Life of King Henry, p. 418.

I. Whether marriage contracted or solemnized in lawful age, *per verba de præsenti*, and without carnal copulation, be matrimony before God or no?

II. Whether such matrimony be consummate, or no? And,

III. What the woman may thereupon demand by the law civil, after the death of her husband? This I suppose was a cause that lay before the king and his ecclesiastical vicegerent, to make some determination of. And I suspect it might relate to Katharine, his late divorced queen.

The archbishop, who was a very good civilian, as well as a divine, but that loved to be wary and modest in all his decisions, made these answers.

1. That as to the first, he and his authors were of opinion that matrimony contracted *per verba de præsenti* was perfect matrimony before God. 2. That such matrimony is not utterly consummated, as that term is commonly used among the school divines and lawyers, but by carnal copulation. 3. As to the woman's demands by the law civil, he therein professed his ignorance. And he had no learned men with him there at Ford, to consult with for their judgments; only Dr. Barbar (a civilian that he always retained with him), who neither could pronounce his mind without his books, and some learned men to confer with upon the case; but he added, that he marvelled that the votes of the civil lawyer should be required herein, seeing that all manner of causes of dower be judged within this realm by the common laws of the same. And that there were plenty of well-learned men in the civil law at London, that undoubtedly could certify the king's majesty of the truth

---

[1] [This "great case of marriage," of "whom it concerned" Strype was ignorant, was that between Henry Fitzroy, late duke of Richmond, —who died when about seventeen years old—and Mary, the daughter of the duke of Norfolk. Cranmer's letter may be seen in the Parker Society's edition of his Works, vol. ii. pp. 359, 360.]

herein, as much as appertained unto that law, warily declining to make any positive judgment in a matter so ticklish. This happened in the month of January.

And indeed in these times there were great irregularities about marriage in the realm, many being incestuous and unlawful. Which caused the Parliament, two or three years past, *viz.* 1533, in one of their acts, to publish a table of degrees, wherein it was prohibited by God's law to marry. But the act did not cure this evil: many thought to bear out themselves in their illegal contracts, by getting dispensations from the archbishop; which created him much trouble by his denying to grant them. There was one Massy, a courtier, who had contracted himself to his deceased wife's niece. Which needing a dispensation, the party got the Lord Crumwel to write to the archbishop in his behalf; especially because it was thought to be none of the cases of prohibition contained in the act. But such was the integrity of the archbishop, that he refused to do anything he thought not allowable, though it were upon the persuasion of the greatest men, or the best friends he had. But he writ this civil letter to the Lord Crumwel upon this occasion.[1]

"My very singular good lord, in my most hearty wise I commend me unto your lordship. And whereas your lordship writeth to me in the favour of this bearer, Massey, an old servant to the king's highness, that being contracted to his sister's daughter of his late wife deceased, he might enjoy the benefit of a dispensation in that behalf; especially, considering it is none of the causes of prohibition contained in the statute:[2] surely, my lord, I would gladly accomplish your request herein, if the word of God would permit the same. And where you require me, that if I think this license may not be granted by the law of God, then I should write unto you the reasons and authorities that move me so to think; that upon declaration unto the king's highness, you may confer thereupon with some other learned men, and so advertise me the king's farther resolution. For shortness of time, I shall show you one reason, which is this. By the law of God many persons be prohibited which be not expressed, but be understood, by like prohibition in equal degree. As St. Ambrose saith,[1] that the niece is forbid by the law of God, although it be not expressed in Leviticus, that the uncle shall not marry his niece. But where the nephew is forbid there, that he shall not marry his aunt, by the same is understood that the niece shall not be married unto her uncle. Likewise as the daughter is not there plainly expressed, yet, where the son is forbid to marry his mother, it is understood that the daughter may not be married to her father; because they be of like degree. Even so it is in this case and many others. For where it is there expressed, that the nephew shall not marry his uncle's wife, it must needs be understood that the niece shall not be married unto the aunt's husband, because that also is one equality of degree. And although I could allege many reasons and authorities more for this purpose; yet I trust this one reason shall satisfy all that be learned, and of judgment.

---

[1] Cleopatra, E. 5 [102].

[2] [28 Hen. VIII. c. 7, in which the terms of the prohibited degrees were nearly the same as in 25 Henry VIII. c. 22.]

"And as touching the act of Parliament concerning the degrees prohibited by God's law, they be not so plainly set forth as I would they were.[2] Wherein I somewhat spake my mind at the making of the said law, but it was not then accepted. I required then, that there must be expressed mother, and mother-in-law; daughter, and daughter-in-law; and so in further degrees directly upwards and downwards, *in linea recta;* also sister, and sister-in-law; aunt, and aunt-in-law; niece, and niece-in-law. And this limitation, in my judgment, would have contained all degrees prohibited by God's law, expressed and not expressed; and should have satisfied this man, and such others which would marry their nieces-in-law.

"I have no news to send you from these parts; but I much long to hear such news as be concurrent with you. And therefore if you have any good news, I pray you to send me some. Thus, my lord, right heartily fare you well. At Ford, the 7th day of September.

"Your lordship's own,

"THO. CANTUARIEN."

---

[1] Vid. Fox, Acts, p. 960. St. Ambros. Op. [Epist. lib. vi.; Epist. 48, "Paterno"].

[2] [See Fox's Acts and Mon. vol. v. p. 67.]

About this year, as near as I can guess, the archbishop made an order concerning the proctors of his Court of Arches. The numerousness and irregularities of proctors made these civil courts uneasy to the people. Complaints were made of their clamorousness, by reason of the plenty of them, that neither advocates nor judges could be heard: of the injuries they did to advocates, in retaining and concluding causes oftentimes without them: and of thrusting themselves into causes without the knowledge or will of the parties, and such like. The evils of which, long after endured, were endeavoured to be redressed by the canons and constitutions, made in the beginning of the reign of King James I. Our archbishop conceived that, in order to the reformation of the proctors, it were good to begin at first with a restraint of the numbers of them. Wherefore he decreed, that whereas the number of the proctors in the Court of Arches was heretofore about twenty, or four and twenty, and my lord's grace at liberty to add more; thenceforth no more should be admitted till the number were reduced to ten: and then that number never to be increased. This liberty, which his predecessors always had, he willingly infringed himself of, out of no other intent but for the benefit and ease of the people, whom he saw were enticed to contention by the crafty insinuations of this kind of men, setting neighbours together by the ears for their own lucre. And therefore the fewer of them, the better. And this number he thought sufficient for the necessary business of the court.

But some looked upon this as a crafty fetch, and plot of the proctors of that time, upon the good nature and pious disposition of the archbishop: that so all others being excluded from officiating as proctors, they might have all the business of the Arches in their own hands. And hence might divers abuses come into that court. And for the confirmation of this order of the archbishop for the tying of his hands, they, who were counsellors to the archbishop in this matter, got it confirmed by the chapter and convent of Christ's Church, Canterbury. This giving offence to many, there were some who drew up a long paper against this order, and presented it to the consideration of the Parliament; because it could be redressed no other way, the archbishop having put it out of his own power to do it. In this paper they set forth, that the said statute was prejudicial unto the commonwealth, because the number of ten proctors was not sufficient to despatch the causes that came into that court; and so there must be delays and prolix suits, while these proctors were attending other causes in the archbishop's court of audience, and the bishop of London's court of consistory. Whereas before it had been seen by experience, that twenty proctors could not suffice for the managery of the causes in these courts, without delays and prorogations, from day to day. That causes by this means could not be diligently attended, when there were many causes, and few proctors to look after them. And hereby many good causes were like to perish for lack of good looking after. That this had occasioned the proctors to neglect a very good oath, called *Juramentum Calumpniæ;* which was the best provision that could be against unlawful suits, and lengthening them out further than was necessary. This oath was, that the parties or the proctors should swear, that they believed their cause was just, and that they should not use unlawful delays, whereby justice might be deferred; that they should answer the judge truly to what he should demand of them; that nothing should be given or promised to the judges or any other officer, besides the fees allowed by law; and that they should not procure any false witness. Again, this paper urged for a good number of proctors, that this would be a means that the judges could not so easily keep them in subjection and fear of them: whereby they had been hindered sometimes in speaking freely before them in their clients' causes. It was urged also, that it was a great discouragement to young men in studying the law, when there is so little prospect of benefit thereby. Lastly, that it was contrary to the civil and canon law, that permits any man to be proctor for another, a few excepted. But this paper, notably enough written, may be read at large in the Appendix.[1] And so I leave the reader to judge of the expediency of this order of the archbishop, by weighing the archbishop's reasons with these last mentioned. Surely this his act deserved commendation for his good intentions thereby, though some lesser inconveniences

[1] No. XVIII.

attended, which no doubt he had also well considered before he proceeded to do what he did.

When Queen Ann, on May the 2nd, was sent to the Tower by a sudden jealousy of the king her husband; the next day the archbishop, extremely troubled at it, struck in with many good words with the king on her behalf, in form of a letter of consolation to him;[1] yet wisely making no apology for her, but acknowledging how divers of the lords had told him of certain of her faults, which, he said, he was sorry to hear; and concluded, desiring that the king would, however, continue his love to the Gospel, lest it should be thought that it was for her sake only that he had favoured it. Being in the Tower, there arose up new matter against Queen Ann, namely, concerning some lawful impediment of her marriage with the king; and that was thought to be a precontract between her and the earl of Northumberland. Whereupon the archbishops of Canterbury and York were made commissioners to examine this matter. And she, being before the archbishop of Canterbury, confessed certain *just, true, and lawful impediments,* as the Act in the 26 of Henry VIII.[2] expresseth it; but not mentioning what they were. So that by that act the said marriage is declared never to have been good, nor consonant to the laws. Yet the earl of Northumberland, being examined upon oath before both the archbishops, denied it; upon the truth of which he received also the blessed sacrament. And the Lord Herbert saw an original letter to Secretary Crumwel, to the same import.[3] But her confession of it so far prevailed with the king, that he would be divorced from her; and with our archbishop, that he performed it by due order and process of law. And an Act passed, that the marriage between the king and Queen Ann was null and void, and the issue illegitimate.

The archbishop granted a license, dated July the 24th, with the full consent of Richard Withipol, vicar of Walthamstow in Essex, to George Monoux, Alderman of London, and Thomas his son, to have the sacrament administered in his chapel, or oratory, in his house De Moones, now a farm near Higham-hill, in the said parish of Walthamstow;[1] indulging therein to the wife of the said Thomas to be purified or churched in the same chapel. I the rather mention this, that it may serve to recall the memory of that pious and charitable citizen and draper, Sir George Monoux, who built the fair steeple of that parish-church, and allowed a salary for ever for ringing the great bell at a certain hour in the night and morning the winter half-year. He built also the north aisle of the said church; in the glass windows whereof is yet remaining his coat of arms. In the chancel his body was interred, under a fair altar-monument yet standing. In the churchyard he founded an hospital and free-school, and very liberally endowed it; though now the endowments are sadly diminished. He also made a causeway over Walthamstow-marsh to Lockbridge, over the river Lee, for the conveniency of travellers from those parts to London, and left wherewith to continue and keep it in repair; but that also is lost, and the ruins now only to be seen. But enough of that.

---

[1] Life of King Henry, p. 446.

[2] [Strype is mistaken in his reference to the 26 Hen. VIII. The words, which he quotes in Italics are found in 28 Hen. VIII. c. 7.]

[3] [See Life of Henry VIII. p. 448.]

The Germans conceived great hope of good to befall the church by Cranmer's influence and presidency in England; and took their opportunities of addressing to him. This year Martin Bucer published a large book in folio upon the Epistle to the Romans, intituled "Metaphrasis et Enarratio;" and dedicated it in a long epistle to the archbishop. Wherein are sundry expressions, which will show how well known abroad the archbishop was already among the Protestants, and what an excellent bishop they looked upon him to be, and how fixed their eyes were upon him for doing great things towards a reformation in England. For thus he writ in this epistle:—"Te omnes prædicant animo præditum Archiepiscopo, et tanti, sicque ad gloriam Christi comparati regni, primate digno," &c. "That all men proclaimed him endowed with a mind worthy of an archbishop and primate of so great a kingdom, and so disposed to the glory of Christ. That he had so attained to this high estate in Christ by his spiritual wisdom, holiness of life, and most ardent zeal to render Christ's glory more illustrious; that gathering together the humble, and taking pity upon the sheepfold, being indeed dispersed and scattered abroad, he always sought and saved that which was lost, and brought back Christ's poor sheep to his fold, and the pastures of everlasting life, when they had been before most miserably harassed by the servants of superstition, and the emissaries of the Roman tyranny." And, after speaking of the king's rooting out the usurpation of the pope, and his pretended jurisdiction, by taking to himself the supremacy, the said learned man excited Cranmer to a further reformation, by telling him, "how easy now it would be for him, and the other archbishops and bishops, who were endued with the spirit and zeal of Christ, from the remainders of the ecclesiastical administration, to retain what might contribute to the true edifying of consciences, the saving instruction of youth, and to the just discipline and polity of the whole Christian people. For when the enemies were once removed out of the way, there could not then happen among us any extraordinary great concussion of religion and ecclesiastical discipline, or any dashing one against another, as among them in Germany of necessity came to pass; striving so many years, for the Church of Christ, against such obstinate enemies."

---

[1] Cran. Regist.

The consecrations this year were these:—

Diocesan Bishops.

June the 10th, Richard Sampson, doctor of decrees, and dean of the king's chapel, was elected and confirmed bishop of Chichester, by resignation of Robert Sherburn, who was now very old. No consecration set down in the Register.[1]

June William Rugg,[2] a monk, was consecrated bishop of Norwich. This is omitted also, if I mistake not, in the Register. Probably he was consecrated with Sampson.

July the 2nd, Robert Warton, abbot of Bermondsey, was consecrated bishop of St. Asaph, at Lambeth,[3] by the archbishop, John [Salcot], bishop of Bangor, and William [Rugg], bishop of Norwich, assisting.

Suffragan Bishops.

October 20, William More, B.D., consecrated suffragan of Colchester, by John [Hilsey], Bishop of Rochester, by virtue of the archbishop's letters commissional to him, assisted by Robert [Warton], bishop of St. Asaph, and Thomas [Wellys], Bishop of Sidon.[1] This More held the monastery of Walden in Essex, an house of Benedictines, *in commendam* (where Audley-end now stands), and surrendered it to the king 1539.

---

[1] Cran. Regist. [2] Goodwin's Catal. [p. 354]. [3] Cran. Regist.

CHAPTER XIII.

The Bishops' Book.

THE pious archbishop thought it highly conducible to the Christian growth of the common people, in knowledge and religion, and to disentangle them from gross ignorance and superstition, in which they had been nursled up by their popish guides, that the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, and the grounds of Religion, should be explained soundly and orthodoxly, and recommended unto their reading. Wherefore he, consulting with the Lord Crumwel, his constant associate and assistant in such matters; and by his and other his friends, importuning the king, a commission was issued out from him, in the year 1537, to the archbishop, to Stokesly, bishop of London; Gardiner, of Winchester; Sampson, of Chichester; Repps, of Norwich; Goodrick, of Ely; Latimer, of Worcester; Shaxton, of Salisbury; Fox, of Hereford; Barlow, of St. David's, and other bishops and learned divines, to meet together, and to devise an wholesome and plain exposition upon those subjects, and to set forth a truth of religion purged of errors and heresies. Accordingly they met at the archbishop's house at Lambeth. Their course was, that after they had drawn up their expositions upon each head, and agreed thereto, they all subscribed their hands, declaring their consent and approbation.

In the disputations which happened among them in this work, Winchester, the pope's chief champion, with three or four other of the bishops, went about with all subtle sophistry, to maintain all idolatry, heresy, and superstition, written in the Canon Law, or used in the church under the pope's tyranny.[1] But at the last, whether overpowered with number, or convinced by the word of God, and consent of ancient authors, and the primitive church, they all agreed upon, and set their hands to a godly book of religion, which they finished by the end of July, and staid for nothing but the vicar-general's order, whether to send it immediately to him, or that the bishop of Hereford should bring it with him, at his next coming to the court. But the plague now raging in Lambeth, and people dying even at the palace doors, the archbishop desired Crumwel for the king's license to the bishops to depart for their own safety, their business being now in effect drawn to a conclusion. Soon after the bishops and divines parted, and the archbishop hastened to his house at Ford, near Canterbury.

---

[1] [See p. 52.]

The book[2] was delivered by Crumwel to the king, which he at his leisure diligently perused, corrected, and augmented. And then, after five or six months, assigned Crumwel to despatch it unto the archbishop, that he might give his judgment upon the king's animadversions. A pursuivant brought it to Ford. The archbishop advisedly read and considered what the king had writ; and, disliking some things, made his own annotations upon some of the royal corrections; there especially, we may well imagine, where the king had altered the book in favour of some of the old doctrines and corruptions. And, when he sent it back again with those annotations, he wrote these lines to Crumwel therewith, on the 25th day of January.[3]

"My very singular good lord,—After most hearty commendations unto your lordship, these shall be to advertise the same, that as concerning the book lately devised by me, and other bishops of this realm, which you sent unto me, corrected by the king's highness, your lordship shall receive the same again by this bearer, the pursuivant, with certain annotations of mine own concerning the same, wherein I trust the king's highness will pardon my presumption, that

---

[1] Fox MS. Life of Cranmer [Harl. MSS. ccccxvii. 91].

[2] [The title of this book was, "The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man;" which was called "The Bishops' Book,"—as "The Necessary Doctrine," afterwards issued, was called "The King's Book." See Dr. Jenkyn's Remains of Cranmer, vol. i. p. 187.]

[3] Cleopatra, E. 5 [101].

I have been so scrupulous, and as it were a picker of quarrels to his grace's book, making a great matter of every little fault, or rather where no fault is at all, which I do only for this intent; that because now the book shall be set forth by his grace's censure and judgment, I would have nothing therein that Momus could reprehend. And yet I refer all mine annotations again to his grace's most exact judgment. And I have ordered my annotations so by numbers, that his grace may readily turn to every place. And in the lower margin of this book, next to the binding, he may find the numbers, which shall direct him to the words, whereupon I make the annotations. And all those his grace's castigations, which I have made none annotations upon, I like them very well. And in divers places I have made annotations, which places nevertheless I mislike not, as shall appear by the same annotations."

At length this book came forth, printed by Barthelet, in the year 1537, and was commonly called "The Bishops' Book," because the bishops were the composers of it. It was intituled, "The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man;" and consisted of a declaration of the Lord's Prayer, and of the Ave Mary, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the seven Sacraments. It was established by act of Parliament, having been signed by the two archbishops, nineteen bishops, eight archdeacons, and seventeen doctors of divinity and law.

The opinion that the favourers of the Gospel had of this book in those times may appear by what I find in a manuscript of the life of this archbishop, by an unknown author,[1] that wrote it soon after the said archbishop's death:—"A godly book of religion, not much unlike the book set forth by King Edward IV., except in two points. The one was the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the altar, of the which opinion the archbishop was at that time, and the most part of the other bishops and learned men. The other error was of praying, kissing, and kneeling before images, which, saith he, was added by the king, after the bishops had set their hands to the contrary."

But this book came forth again two years after, viz., 1540 (unless my manuscript mistake this year for 1543), very much enlarged, and reduced into another form, and bearing another name, "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition of any Christian Man." And because the king had put it forth by his own authority, it was called now, "The King's Book," as before it was called "The Bishops'." But that none might be confounded in these books, he may know that there was, in the year 1536, another book also called "The Bishops' Book," upon the same reason that this was so called, because the archbishops and bishops had the making thereof.[1] It was a declaration against the papal supremacy, written upon occasion of Pole's book of Ecclesiastical Union, mentioned before. And in the year 1533, there came forth another book, in Latin, called "The King's Book," intituled, "The Difference between the Kingly and Ecclesiastic Power,"[2] reported to be made, as Bale writes,[3] by Fox, the king's almoner, which was translated into English, and put forth by Henry Lord Stafford, in King Edward's days. The king affecting to be thought learned, affected also to have books called by his name; not that he was always the author of them, but that they came out by his authority, and had undergone his corrections and emendations.

---

[1] Inter Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxvii. 91].

But before we pass away from hence, it may be convenient to give the reader a little taste of so famous a treatise as that Bishops' Book was in those days. And I will do it, not in my own words, but in the words of a very learned and eminent man, the answerer to Dr. Martin's book against priests' marriage, not far from the beginning of Queen Mary, supposed to be Ponet, bishop of Winchester,[4] then in exile. Applying himself, in his preface, unto the queen's prelates, he told them:—"That in their book, intituled, 'The Institution of a Christian Man,' presented by their whole authorities, to the king of famous memory, King Henry VIII., in the preface thereof they affirmed to his highness, with one assent, by all their learnings, that the said treatise was in all points concordant and agreeable to

---

[1] Lord Herbert's Hist. p. 418.
[2] Ibid. p. 408.
[3] Bale's Cent. [Script. Illust. Cat. p. 711].
[4] [Strype's supposition is incorrect. The book was said to have been written by Parker, Cranmer's successor in the see of Canterbury. See Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. i. p. 202, and Wharton's notes in the Appendix.]

Holy Scripture; yea, such doctrine, that they would and desired to have it taught by all the spiritual pastors to all the king's loving subjects, to be doctrine of faith. And there entreating of the sacrament of orders, they desired to have it taught, that we be in no subjection to the bishop of Rome and his statutes, but merely subject to the king's laws, under his only territory and jurisdiction. And that the canons and rules of the church were therefore allowable in the realm, because the assent of the king and of the people accepted the same. And that priests and bishops whatsoever never had any authority by the Gospel, in matters civil and moral, but by the grant and gift of princes; and that it was alway, and ever shall be, lawful unto kings and princes, and to their successors, with the consent of their Parliaments, to revoke and call again into their own hands, or otherwise to restrain all their power and jurisdiction given and permitted by their authority, assent, or sufferance, &c., without the which, if the bishop of Rome, or any other bishop whatsoever, should take upon them any authority or jurisdiction in such matters as be civil, no doubt, said they, that bishop is not worthy to be called a bishop, but rather a tyrant, and an usurper of other men's rights, contrary to the laws of God, and is to be reputed a subverter of the kingdom of Christ. Yea, besides these things, and many other, as he added, they put in our creed, or belief, as an article of salvation or damnation, that the Church of England is as well to be named a Catholic and Apostolic Church, as Rome Church, or any other church where the Apostles were resident. And that they willed us to believe in our faith, that there is no difference in superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, one over the other, but be all of equal power and dignity, and that all churches be free from the subjection and jurisdiction of the Church of Rome. And that no church is to be called schismatical, as varying from the unity of Church of Christ, if it persist in the unity of Christ's faith, hope, and charity, and unity of Christ's doctrine and sacraments, agreeable to the same doctrine.

"And that it appertained to Christian kings and princes, in the discharge of their duty to God, to reform and reduce again the laws of their old limits and pristine state, of their power and jurisdiction, which was given them by Christ, and used in the primitive church. For it is, say they, out of all doubt, that Christ's faith was then most firm and pure, and the Scriptures of God were then best understood, and virtue did then most abound and excel. And, therefore, the customs and ordinances then used and made, must needs be more conform and agreeable unto the true doctrine of Christ, and more conducing to the edifying and benefit of the Church of Christ, than any custom or laws used or made since that time. This he collected out of their exposition of the sacrament of orders."[1]

The said learned author observed, that this doctrine was set forth by the whole authority of the bishops in those days, presented by the subscription of all their names. And since the time of their presenting thereof by the space almost of twenty years (that is, to the middle of Queen Mary), never revoked but continually from time to time taught by this book, and by such other declarations.

And that one more particular relating to this book may be known, namely, who the bishops and other divines were that composed it, and that were commissioned so to do, I shall record their names, as they were found writ by the hand of Dr. Sam. Ward, in his own book, now in the possession of N[icholas] B[atteley], a reverend friend of mine; who hath well deserved of this history.

Thomas Cant. Jo. Lond. Steph. Winton. Jo. Exon. Jo. Lincoln. Jo. Bathon. Roland. Coven. et Lich. Tho. Elien. Nic. Sarum. Jo. Bang. Edward Heref. Hugo. Wigorn. Jo. Roffen. Ric. Cicestr. Guilielm. Norv. Guilielm. Menevens. Rob. Assav. Rob. Landav. Edoard Ebor. Cuthb. Dunelm. Rob. Carliolen.

Richard. Wolman, Archidiac. Sudbur. Guil. Knight, Archid. Richmon. Jo. Bell, Archid. Gloc. Edmund. Bonner, Archid. Leicestr. John Skip, Archid. Dorset. Nic. Hethe, Archid. Stafford. Cuthb. Marshal, Archid. Nottingham. Rich. Curren, Archid. Oxon.

Guilielm. Cliff, Galfridus Downes, Robertus Oking, Radul. Bradford, Richardus Smith, Simon Matthew, Joannes Pryn, Guliel. Buckmaster, Guliel. May, Nic. Wotton, Ric. Coxe, Joannes Edmunds, Thomas Robertson, Joannes Baker,

---

[1] Defence of Priest's Mar. p. 226.

Thomas Barret, Joannas Hase, Joannes Tyson, sacræ theologiæ, juris ecclesiastici et civilis professores.

In the year 1543, the same book was printed again, amended much both in sense and language; yet not having any step in the progress of the Reformation more than the former, each edition expressing positively the corporal presence in the sacrament. But in this is much added about free-will, which it asserts, and good works. In 1544, the same was printed again at London, in Latin, intituled, "Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio."

CHAPTER XIV.

The Archbishop visits his Diocese.

As soon as this business was over with the archbishop and bishops at Lambeth, no Parliament sitting this year, and a plague being in London and Westminster, he went down, as was said before,[1] into his diocese. But before he went, he expressed a great desire to wait upon the king, being then, I suppose, at Hampton Court or Windsor; but he feared he should not be permitted, coming out of the smoky air, as he wrote to the Lord Crumwel, in that time of infection. Yet he desired to know the king's pleasure by him. He had a mind indeed to leave some good impressions upon the king's mind in the behalf of the book, that he and the rest had taken such pains about, and but newly made an end of. But whether he saw the king now or no, he had his commission, and took it down with him. Which he advisedly did, the better to warrant and bear him out in what he intended to do in his diocese, which he purposed to visit.

This was a year of visitation. For there was a new visitation now again appointed throughout all England; to see how the people stood affected to the king, to discover cheats and impostures, either in images, relics, or such like. The archbishop also thinking good now to visit his diocese, procured the license of the vicegerent, Lord Crumwel, so to do; because, I suppose, all other visitations were to cease, to give way to the king's visitation. And to render his

[1] [p. 74.]

power of visiting the more unquestionable, and void of scruple, he desired the vicegerent, that, in drawing up of his commission, his license to visit might be put into it by Dr. Peter;[1] who was then, if I mistake not, master of the faculties to the said vicegerent, and afterwards secretary of state. And because he would not do anything without the counsel and allowance of the vicegerent, he asked his advice, how he should order in his visitation such persons as had transgressed the king's injunctions. Which came out the year before under Crumwel's name; whereof some were for the restraint of the number of holy-days, a great cause of superstition, and of the continuance of it. And afterwards other injunctions came out; whereof the first was, that in all parishes, once every Sunday, for a quarter of a year together, the supremacy should be taught, and the laws to that intent read. These injunctions were in number eleven, as they are set down in the Lord Herbert's history.[2]

The vicar of Croydon, under the archbishop's nose, had been guilty of certain misdemeanours; which, I suppose, were speaking or preaching to the disparagement of the king's supremacy, and in favour of the pope. Now before he went into the country, and having as yet divers bishops and learned men with him at Lambeth, he thought it advisable to call this man before them at this time. But before he would do it, he thought it best to consult with Crumwel, and take his advice, whether he should now do it, and before these bishops or not; so ticklish a thing then was it for the bishops to do any things of themselves without the privity and order of this great vicegerent. Cranmer was aware of it, and therefore required direction from him in everything.

But whatsoever was done with this vicar, the archbishop was soon down in his diocese; and, having taken an account of the people and clergy, what conformity they bare to the king's laws and injunctions; he found them superstitiously set upon the observation of their old holy-days. Some whereof he punished, and others he admonished, according to the degree of their crimes. And he discovered the chief cause to lie in the curates and priests, who did animate the people to what they did: indeed their interest and gain was concerned. The great inconvenience of these holy-days lay partly in the numerousness of them; so that the attendance upon them hindered despatching, and doing justice in Westminster Hall in the terms, and the gathering in harvest in the country; partly in the superstitions that these holy-days maintained, in the idolatrous worship of supposed saints; and partly in the riot, debauchery and drunkenness, that these times were celebrated with among the common people; and lastly, the poverty it brought upon the meaner sort, being detained from going about their ordinary labours and callings, to provide for themselves and families.

---

[1] [*i. e.* Sir William Peter, a master in Chancery, who had been appointed by Crumwel, with other deputies, to visit the monasteries. See Parker Society's edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 315.]

[2] Page 472.

For the prevention of these superstitions for the future, and to make the people more obedient to the king's laws, he gave out strict orders to all parsons of parishes, upon pain of deprivation, that they should cause the abrogated holy-days not to be observed for the future; and to present to the archbishop all persons in their respective parishes, as should do contrary to any of the king's ordinances already set forth, or that should be hereafter by his authority, relating to the doctrine and ceremonies of the Church. And this course he conceived so good an expedient, that he counselled the lord vicegerent, that all bishops in their several dioceses might be commanded to do the same, for the avoiding of disobedience and contention in the realm. By which means, he said, "the evil-will of the people might be conveyed from the king and his council, upon the ordinaries; and so the love and obedience of the people better secured to their sovereign." Such was his care of his prince, to preserve him in the affections of his people, that he was willing to take upon himself their enmity, that it might not light upon the king. But Cranmer had observed these holy-days were kept by many, even in the court under the king's eye; which he well knew was an example and encouragement to the whole nation. And therefore he signified to the Lord Crumwel, that they would never persuade the people to cease from keeping them, when the king's own household were an example unto the rest to break his own ordinances. See his letter to Crumwel in the Appendix.[1]

CHAPTER XV.

The Bible printed.

He was now at Ford; and it was in the month of August, when something fell out that gave the good archbishop as much joy as ever happened to him in all the time of his prelacy. It was the printing of the Holy Bible, in the English tongue, in the great volume, which was now finished, by the great pains and charges of Richard Grafton, the printer. Osiander, who knew the archbishop well when he was the king's ambassador in Germany, saith of him, that he was *sacrarum literarum studiosissimum*. Indeed, he always had a great value for the Scriptures, because they were the word of God; and extraordinary desirous he was, from the very first entrance upon his bishopric, that the people might have the liberty of reading it, and for that purpose to have it interpreted into the vulgar language. And so, by Crumwel's means, he got leave from the king that it might be translated and printed. The care of the translation lay wholly upon him, assigning little portions of this holy book to divers bishops and learned men to do, and, being despatched, to be sent back to him. But he could not see his desire effected by these men, till it was happily done by other hands; and, to his inexpressible satisfaction, he saw the work finished in this year, about July or August.

As soon as some of the copies came to his hand, one he sent to Crumwel, entreating him that he would present it from him to the king (and no question he thought it the noblest present that ever he made him), and withal to intercede with his majesty, that the said book might by his authority be both bought and used by all indifferently; both which Crumwel did, for which the archbishop was full of gladness and gratitude, and wrote two letters to him soon after one another, wherein he thanked him most heartily, telling him "How he had hereby made his memory famous to posterity within the realm, among all such as should hereafter be favourers of God's word, and that he should hear of this good deed of his at the last day. That for his part, it was such a content to his mind, that he could not have done him a greater pleasure, if he had given him a thousand pounds. And that such knowledge would ensue hereupon, that it should appear he had done excellent service both to God and the king." He also particularly spake of the bishop of Worcester [Latimer], how highly obliged he was sure he was to him for this. But I refer the reader to his own letters which follow.[1]

---

[1] No. XIX.

"My very singular good lord,—In my most hearty wise I commend me unto your lordship. And whereas I understand that your lordship, at my request, hath not only exhibited the Bible which I sent unto you, to the king's majesty, but also hath obtained of his grace, that the same shall be allowed by his authority, to be bought and read within this realm; my lord, for this your pains, taken in this behalf, I give you my most hearty thanks, assuring your lordship, for the contentation of my mind, you have showed me more pleasure here, than if you had given me a thousand pounds; and I doubt not but that hereby such fruit of good knowledge shall ensue, that it shall well appear hereafter what high and excellent service you have done unto God and the king, which shall so much redound to your honour that, besides God's reward, you shall obtain perpetual memory for the same within this realm. And as for me, you may reckon me your bondman for the same. And I dare be bold to say, so may ye do, my lord of Worcester. Thus, my lord, right heartily fare ye well. At Ford, the xiii. day of August.

"Your own boundman ever,
"T. CANTUARIEN."

And in another letter, fifteen days after, he again renewed his thanks.[2]

"My very singular and special good lord,—In my most hearty wise I commend me to your lordship. These shall be to give you most hearty thanks, that any heart can think, and that in the name of them which favour God's word, for your diligence at this time, in procuring the king's highness to set forth the said God's word, and his Gospel, by his grace's authority; for the which act, not only the king's majesty, but also you, shall have a perpetual laud and memory of all them that be now, or hereafter shall be, God's faithful people, and the favourers of his word. And this deed you shall hear of at the great day, when all things shall be opened, and made manifest. For our Saviour Christ saith in the said Gospel, that whosoever shrinketh from Him and His word, and is abashed to profess and set it forth before men in this world, He will refuse him at that day; and contrary, whosoever constantly doth profess Him and His word, and studieth to set that forward in this world, Christ will declare the same at the last day before his Father and all His angels, and take upon Him the defence of those men."

---

[1] Cleopatra, E. v. p. 329.

[2] Cleopatra, E. vi. p. 292.

Now, because by these letters of the archbishop it appears how instrumental Crumwel was, when the Bible was printed, to procure the setting it forth by the king's authority, I will here relate more at large what countenance and assistance he gave to this pious work all along, and those that were concerned and employed in the doing of it.

The Bible, as Fox speaks,[1] had been printed in the year 1532, and reprinted again four or five years after. The undertakers and printers were Grafton and Whitchurch, who printed it at Hambugh. The corrector was John Rogers, a learned divine, afterwards a canon of St. Paul's, in King Edward's time, and the first martyr in the next reign. The translator was William Tyndal, another learned martyr, with the help of Miles Coverdale, after bishop of Exeter. But before all this second edition was finished, Tyndal was taken and put to death for his religion, in Flanders, in the year 1536. And his name then growing into ignominy, as one burnt for an heretic, they thought it might prejudice the book if he should be named for the translator thereof; and so they used a feigned name, calling it Thomas Matthew's Bible; though Tyndal, before his death, had finished all but the Apocrypha, which was translated by

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments;—"of the Bible in English, printed in the large volume," &c. vol. v. p. 410.]

Rogers above-said, who added also some marginal notes. In this Bible were certain prologues, and a special table collected of the commonplaces in the Bible, and texts of Scripture for proving the same; and chiefly the commonplaces of the Lord's Supper, the marriage of priests, and the mass, of which it was there said, that it was not to be found in Scripture. This Bible giving the clergy offence, was gotten to be restrained.

When Grafton had finished this work, and printed off fifteen hundred Bibles at his great charge, amounting to five hundred pounds (a round sum in those days), the Lord Crumwel desired to have six of his books, which he forthwith sent by his servant, a clear man of all suspicion of any infection, coming that day out of Flanders, Grafton not adventuring to come himself with the books, because of the infection at London, where he was. These books, therefore he sent, together with a letter of thanks for being so assistant in the publication (which, as he writ in his letter, the archbishop said, the tidings of did him more good than the gift of ten thousand pounds), and for procuring the king's license, which was thought fit to be signified in the titlepage in red letters, thus, "Set forth by the king's most gracious license." But several would not believe the king had licensed it; and therefore he desired further of Crumwel, that he would get it licensed under the privy seal, which would be a defence for the present, and for the future. But take the letter as Grafton himself penned it.[1]

"Most humbly beseeching your lordship to understand, that, according to your request, I have sent your lordship six Bibles, which gladly I would have brought myself, but because of the sickness which remaineth in the city; and therefore I have sent them by my servant, which this day came out of Flanders, requiring your lordship, if I may be so bold as to desire you to accept them as my simple gift, given to you for those most godly pains, for which the heavenly Father is bound, even of His justice, to reward you with the everlasting kingdom of God. For your lordship's moving our most gracious prince to the allowance and licensing of such a work, hath wrought such an act worthy of praise, as never was mentioned in any chronicle in this realm; and, as my lord of Canterbury said, the tidings thereof did him more good than the gift of ten thousand pounds, yet certain there are which believe not that it pleased the king's grace to license it to go forth. Wherefore, if your lordship's pleasure were such, that we might have it licensed under your privy seal, it would be a defence at this present, and in time to come, for all enemies and adversaries of the same. And forasmuch as this request is for the maintenance of the Lord's word, which is to maintain the Lord Himself, I fear not but that your lordship will be earnest therein. And I am assured that my lord of Canterbury [Cranmer], Worcester [Latimer], and Salisbury [Shaxton], will give your lordship such thanks as in them lieth. And sure ye may be, that the heavenly Lord will reward you for the establishment of His glorious truth. And what your lordship's pleasure is in this request, if it may please your lordship to inform my servant, I and all that love God heartily, are bound to pray for your preservation all the days of our life. At London, the xxviii. day of this present month of August, 1537.

---

[1] Cleopatra, E. 5 [p. 330].

"Your orator while he liveth,
"Richard Grafton, Grocer."

And as this printer had addressed to Crumwel for the privy seal, so he apprehended now a further need of the corroboration of authority upon another account. For some, observing how exceeding acceptable the English Bible was to the common people, were designing to print it in a less volume and smaller letters, whereby it would come to pass, that Grafton would be undersold; and so he and his creditors would be undone; and besides, it was like to prove a very ill edition, and very erroneous. Insomuch that Grafton affirmed, they would commit as many faults as there were sentences in the Bible. And it must needs be so, because then the printers were generally Dutchmen within the realm, that could neither speak nor write true English: nor for covetousness-sake would they allow any learned men at all to oversee and correct what they printed, as formerly it had been printed, but paper, letter, ink and correction would be all naught. Therefore he desired one favour more of the Lord Crumwel; and that was, to obtain for him of the king, that none should print the Bible for three years but himself. And to move him, he said he was sure the bishop of Canterbury, and other his special friends, would not be unthankful to him. He urged to him, that his whole living lay upon this point. And for the better and quicker sale of his books, he desired also, that, by his commandment in the king's name, every curate might be obliged to have one; that they might learn to know God, and to instruct their parishioners; and that every abbey should have six, to be laid in several places of the convent. He wished some commissions might be issued out to the archbishop of Canterbury [Cranmer], and the bishops of Sarum [Shaxton] and Worcester [Latimer]; and they would readily cause this to be done in their dioceses. To which he earnestly added his own arguments to provoke Crumwel to yield to his request. This letter may be found in the Appendix.[1]

CHAPTER XVI.

Many Suffragan Bishops made.

It was now forbidden by the Parliament, and in pursuance thereof by the bishops in their several dioceses, that the feast of St. Thomas à Becket, the pretended martyr, should be celebrated any more; nor of St. Laurence, nor of divers others, the feasts of the twelve Apostles excepted, and of our Lady, St. Michael, and Mary Magdalene. Also the feast of the holy cross was forbid; and commanded, that none should presume to keep those feasts holy; that is, they should ring no bells, nor adorn their churches, nor go in procession, nor do other such-like things as belonged to the celebration of festivals.[2] So when St. Thomas's eve came, which had used constantly by the archbishops of Canterbury, and their domestics, to be celebrated by fasting, Archbishop Cranmer took no notice of that eve, but eat flesh, and supped in his parlour with his family. Which created much observation, it having never been seen before; the archbishop thinking it unworthy that a man of that devotion to the see of Rome, and disloyalty to his natural prince, should be so religiously commemorated.

---

[1] No. XX.

[2] August. Monks' Journal Harl. MSS. ccccxix. 113].

A Bishop Diocesan consecrated.

March the 25th, Robert Holgate, master of the order of Sempringham, was consecrated bishop of Landaff, in the chapel of St. Mary, in the conventual church of Friars Preachers in the city of London, by John [Hilsey] bishop of Rochester, by virtue of letters commissional from the archbishop to him; John [Capon, *alias* Salcot] bishop of Bangor, and Nicholas [Shaxton] bishop of Sarum, assisting. This Holgate was either abbot or prior of St. Mary Watte, an house of Gilbertines, which he held *in commendam*, and surrendered in the year 1539.

Suffragan Bishops.

June the 24th, John Bird, S. Th. P. provincial of the order of Friars Carmelites of the city of London, was consecrated suffragan of the see of Penrith, in Llandaff diocese; and

Lewis Thomas, formerly abbot of the monastery of Kynmer, suffragan bishop of the see of Salop; both consecrated at Lambeth by the archbishop. The assistant bishops at this consecration not mentioned in the Register.

Of Bird, a word or two; I find him in Norwich about the year 1531, busy with Bilney before his death.[1] He was a person King Henry made use of, for in the year 1535 he, with Fox the almoner, and Bedel, a clerk of the council, were sent to Queen Katharine, divorced from the king, to forbear the name of queen; which nevertheless she would not do. He preached certain sermons before the king against the Pope's supremacy. Bale, in his exposition upon the Revelations,[2] makes him to be one of the ten horns that shall hate the whore. Godwin asserts of him, that he was once bishop of Ossory.[3] Bale, in his Centuries, mentions not at all his being an Irish bishop, but, naming his preferments, first calls him *Episcopus Penricensis;* in 1539, made bishop of Bangor, and removed to Chester 1541.[1] He was married, and therefore, upon Queen Mary's access to the crown, was deprived of his bishopric; but complied with the old religion. I find him alive in the year 1555, being then at Fulham at Bishop Bonner's, and there he lodged. Upon his coming he brought his present with him, a dish of apples, and a bottle of wine. While he was here, he exhorted Mr. Hawkes, convented for pretended heresy before Bonner, to learn of his elders, and to bear with some things, and be taught by the Church, and not to go too far.[2] In that queen's reign he became Bonner's suffragan, and vicar of Dunmow, in Essex.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. iv. p. 643.]

[2] See Parker Society edition of Bishop Bale's Select Works; "The Image of both Churches," paraphrase v. on Rev. xvii. 16, pp. 508-9.]

[3] [Godwin, de præsul. pp. 626, 776.]

November the 4th, Thomas Morley, formerly abbot of Stanley, in Sarum diocese, of the Cistertian order, was consecrated, in the chapel of Lambeth, suffragan of the see of Marlborough, by the archbishop, assisted by John [Longland] bishop of Lincoln, and John [Hilsey] bishop of Rochester.

December the 1st, the archbishop, according to the direction of the act for suffragan bishops, nominated to the king two persons, out of which he might elect a suffragan for Dover, viz. Richard Yngworth, prior of the priory of Langley Regis, and John Codenham, both doctors in divinity. December the 8th, the king answered Cranmer's letter by his privy seal; wherein he appointed Yngworth to be consecrated for his said suffragan. And accordingly December the 9th, John [Stokesley] bishop of London, by virtue of commissional letters from the archbishop, assisted by John [Hilsey] bishop of Rochester, and Robert [Warton] bishop of St. Asaph, consecrated the said Yngworth. On the 10th, the archbishop issued out his commission to the said suffragan ordaining him his suffragan by those presents, until he should think fit to withdraw his said commission again; signifying that what he was to do was within his diocese and city of Canterbury, and jurisdiction of Calais, and the marshes thereof; to confirm children, to bless altars, chalices, vestments, and other ornaments of the church; to suspend places and churches, and to reconcile them; to consecrate churches and altars new set up; to confer all the lesser orders; to consecrate holy oil of chrism and holy unction;

---

[1] [Bale, Script. Illust. Catalog. p. 724.]

[2] Fox's Acts [vol. vii. p. 104].

and to perform all other things belonging to the office of a bishop. The bishop's letter to the king, desiring him to appoint him a suffragan out of those two above named, and the archbishop's commissional letters to suffragan Yngworth, may be seen in the Appendix.[1] And he that is minded to read the form of the king's mandate to the archbishop for making a suffragan, may find it in the History of the Reformation.[2]

The reason why the archbishop all this while, that is, from the first making the act in 1534 to this time, had nominated none for suffragan to this see till now, might be because there seemed to be a suffragan already, even the same that had been in the time of Archbishop Warham, namely, John Thornton, prior of Dover; who was one of the witnesses appointed by that archbishop to certify what was found and seen at the opening of St. Dunstan's tomb.[3] Richard Thornden seems to have succeeded Yngworth in this office some years after; and was very dear to the archbishop, having been by him preferred to be prebend of Canterbury; though he proved very false to him, and was among those that made a treacherous combination against him in the year 1543; and in Queen Mary's time became a great persecutor.

December the 9th, John Hodgkin, professor of divinity, was consecrated at the same time, and by the same bishops as above; but to what see is not mentioned. The bishop of London, together with this Hodgkin, had nominated to the king Robert Struddel, professor of divinity. Both he recommended to the king, by letters, to be made suffragans at large, without mention of any see in his diocese; but only expressing that his diocese wanted the comfort of suffragans, that might bear a part in his cure; and so mentioned those two; adding, that the king might appoint them to some see within the province of Canterbury. Hodgkin, if I mistake not, was consecrated suffragan of Bedford; and was afterwards one of those that assisted at the consecration of Archbishop Parker. He was a Black Friar. In the year 1531 he, with Bird, laboured with Bilney at Norwich, a little before his death, to bring him off from the doctrines for which he was condemned. Afterwards Hodgkin coming nearer under the archbishop's eye, by his means came to better knowledge in religion, and married a wife; but in Queen Mary's time put her away.

---

[1] Nos. XXI. XXII.

[2] Vol. i. Collect. 51, book ii. [vol. i. part ii. b. ii. num. 51, p. 206].

[3] See Somner's Hist. Cant. Append. p. 423.

March 24, Henry Holbeach, prior of the cathedral church of Wigorn, S. T. P. (Hugh [Latimer] bishop of Wigorn having recommended him to the king for suffragan bishop of Bristow), was accordingly consecrated in the bishop of London's chapel, in the said bishop's house, situate in Lambeth-marsh, by the said bishop; Hugh [Latimer] bishop of of Wigorn, and Robert [Warton] bishop of St. Asaph, assisting.

CHAPTER XVII.

The Bible in English allowed.

The next year I find the careful archbishop again at Canterbury, looking after his charge. And here he read lectures upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, half the Lent, in the chapter-house of the monastery of the Holy Trinity.

Now, viz. 1538, the Holy Bible was divulged, and exposed to common sale; and appointed to be had in every parish church. And then, that the sacred book might be used with the more benefit, both of the clergy and lay-people, for this reason a declaration was issued out, to be read openly by all curates, upon the publishing of this Bible, showing the godly ends of his majesty in permitting it to be in English; and directions how they should read and hear it. Namely, to use it with reverence and great devotion; to conform their lives unto it; and to encourage those that were under them—wives, children, and servants—to live according to the rules thereof; that in doubtful places they should confer with the learned for the sense, who should be appointed to preach and explain the same, and not to contend and dispute about them in alehouses and taverns. They that are minded to read this declaration may find it in the Appendix.[1]

---

[1] No. XXIII.

This Bible was of so quick sale, that two years after it was printed again.

It was wonderful to see with what joy this book of God was received, not only among the learneder sort, and those that were noted for lovers of the Reformation, but generally all England over, among all the vulgar and common people; and with what greediness God's word was read, and what resort to places where the reading of it was. Everybody that could bought the book, or busily read it, or got others to read it to them, if they could not themselves; and divers more elderly people learned to read on purpose. And even little boys flocked among the rest to hear portions of the holy Scripture read. One William Maldon, happening in the company of John Fox, in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and Fox being very inquisitive after those that suffered for religion in the former reigns, asked him if he knew any that were persecuted for the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that he might add it to his Book of Martyrs; he told him he knew one that was whipped by his own father in King Henry's reign for it.[1] And when Fox was very inquisitive who he was, and what was his name, he confessed it was himself; and upon his desire he wrote out all the circumstances. Namely, that when the king had allowed the Bible to be set forth to be read in all churches, immediately several poor men in the town of Chelmsford in Essex, where his father lived and he was born, bought the New Testament, and on Sundays sat reading of it in the lower end of the church; many would flock about them to hear their reading, and he among the rest, being then but fifteen years old, came every Sunday to hear the glad and sweet tidings of the Gospel. But his father observing it, once angrily fetched him away, and would have him to say the Latin matins with him; which grieved him much. And as he returned at other times to hear the Scripture read, his father still would fetch him away. This put him upon the thoughts of learning to read English, that so he might read the New Testament himself; which when he had by diligence effected, he and his father's apprentice bought the New Testament, joining their stocks together; and, to conceal it, laid it under the bed-straw, and read it at convenient times. One night, his father being asleep, he and his mother chanced to discourse concerning the crucifix, and kneeling down to it, and knocking on the breast then used, and holding up the hands to it when it came by on procession; this he told his mother was plain idolatry, and against the commandment of God, where He saith, "Thou shalt not make any graven image, nor bow down to it, nor worship it." His mother, enraged at him for this, said "Wilt thou not worship the cross, which was about thee when thou wert christened, and must be laid on thee when thou art dead?" In this heat the mother and son departed and went to their beds. The sum of this evening's conference she presently repeats to her husband, which he, impatient to hear, and boiling in fury against his son, for denying worship to be due to the cross, arose up forthwith, and goes into his son's chamber, and, like a mad zealot, taking him by the hair of his head with both his hands, pulled him out of the bed, and whipped him unmercifully. And when the young man bore this beating, as he related, with a kind of joy, considering it was for Christ's sake, and shed not a tear, his father, seeing that, was more enraged, and ran down and fetched an halter, and put it about his neck, saying he would hang him. At length, with much entreaty of the mother and brother, he left him almost dead. I extract this out of the original relation of the person himself, wrote at Newington, near London, where he afterwards dwelt. Which relation he gave to John Fox.

---

[1] Inter Foxii. MSS. [Harl. MS. DXC. 77].

This year Nicolson, a very learned man, greatly acquainted with Tindal and Frith, and who, by reason of trouble from the bishops formerly, for the better concealing of himself for time to come, called himself Lambert, was adjudged to the flames, and cruelly burnt.[1] Wherein our archbishop and the Lord Crumwel unhappily had their hands; the one in reading the sentence against him *De Hæretico comburendo*, by the king's commandment: and the archbishop, first in having him before him in a judiciary way, and afterwards in disputing publicly against him in favour of the doctrine of the corporal presence. The first occasion of Lambert's troubles was this. At the hearing of a sermon of Dr. Taylor (he who was afterwards bishop of Lincoln, and a favourer of the Gospel), preached by him at St. Peter's, Cornhill, he came and presented him with ten reasons against transubstantiation, written by him. Dr. Taylor, by Dr. Barnes' means, who, though in other things he favoured a reformation, and suffered death upon the six articles, yet was hot against sacramentaries at this time, thinking the broaching that doctrine might throw in some impediment to the progress of the Gospel; Dr. Taylor, I say, by Barne's advice, carried these reasons to the archbishop. Who, upon this, conventing Lambert before him endeavoured to reclaim him, by holding much discourse with him. The news of this came to the court. And by the instigation of [Gardiner], the bishop of Winchester, the king resolved to dispute with him himself in a very public and solemn manner; and that because he had appealed from the bishop to the king.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. pp. 230, 236.]

The day being come, and the king present, with all his bishops on the right hand, and the nobles on the left, accompanied with his lawyers and other attendants, on purpose to terrify him, and to make an open signification, that though he had cast off the papal supremacy, yet he intended not to be a favourer of heresy so called; first commanded Richard Sampson, bishop of Chichester (Fox saith it was Day, bishop of Chichester; but in that he was mistaken, for he was not yet bishop), to begin, and give the reason of the meeting. He appointed the bishops now present to answer Lambert's ten reasons, as Fox;[1] or his eight, as the bishop of Chichester in his declaration mentioned. The archbishop answered the second, for the king himself had disputed against the first. The archbishop, according to his mild temper, but withal according to the false opinion which he then most confidently maintained, styling him Brother Lambert, desired the matter might be decided indifferently between them: and that if he convinced Lambert by Scripture, Lambert would be willing to come over from his opinion: but if Lambert, on the other hand, could by Scripture convince him, he promised to embrace his opinion. Then he fell upon Lambert's reason, which was taken out of the Acts of the Apostles, where Christ appeared unto Paul by the way: disputing from that place, that it was not disagreeable to the word of God, that the body of Christ may be in two places at once: which being in heaven, was seen at the same time by St. Paul upon the earth. And, said the archbishop, "If it may be in two places, why, by the like reason, may it not be in many places?" In what order and course the rest of the bishops disputed, or rather baited this poor man, it is uncertain; only Winchester had the sixth place, Tunstal of Durham next to him, and next Stokesley bishop of London. Richard [Sampson], bishop of Chichester, who was reputed a man of great learning, had his course, to whose turn it came to confute Lambert's sixth reason, which was taken from that of St. Paul to the Romans, "Who hath ascended up to heaven, to bring down Christ from thence?"[1] His argument is preserved in the Cotton library.[2] I refer the reader to the Appendix, where he shall meet with it.[3] Whereby may be seen after what a haughty and indecent manner this meek confessor of Christ was dealt with; as though they designed rather to run him down, and browbeat him, than answer him.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. pp. 229—233.]

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Archbishop's judgment of the Eucharist.

But to return to Cranmer, whose opinion in the point of the sacrament we will stay a little upon. He was now a strong stickler for the carnal presence, and seemed greatly prejudiced to that opinion. There was one Joachim Vadianus, a learned man of St. Gall in Helvetia, and an acquaintance of the archbishop's. He had framed a treatise, intituled, "Aphorisms upon the consideration of the Eucharist," in six books: which were intended to prove no corporal presence. This book he presented to the archbishop: but though he loved him as a learned man, yet he declared himself much displeased with his argument; and wrote to him, "that he wished he had employed his study to better purpose, and that he had begun his correspondence with him in some better and more approved subject; adding, that he would be neither patron nor approver of that docrine, until he saw stronger proofs for it." And so much did he dislike Œcolampadius and Zuinglius their opinion in this matter, that he applied that censure of St. Hierom concerning Origen to them: " That *where they wrote well, nobody writ better; and where ill, nobody worse.* And he wished those learned men had gone no further than to confute papistical errors and abuses, and had not sown their tares with their good corn."

---

[1] Rom. x. 6. [2] Cleopatra, E. 5 [371]. [3] No. XXIV.

That which detained our archbishop in this error was the veneration he had for the ancient doctors of the Church, whose writings, as he then thought, approved the doctrine of this gross presence, judging that none could ever reconcile those authors to the contrary opinion. Indeed he judged it the very doctrine of the Fathers from the beginning of the Church; and he reckoned that it must be a truth, because otherwise it could not consist with God's goodness to his spouse, to leave her in such blindness so long. It seemed also that he built this his error upon the words of Scripture, taking the sense of *This is my body* literally.

Vadian by this book had intended to have brought Cranmer off from this opinion. And before him several attempts had been made that way; but he remained so rooted therein, that he seemed to be ever unmoveable. He supposed also, that the giving up this doctrine would prove a great impediment to the work of the Gospel, that now proceeded well in the nation. He advised and beseeched all, both Lutherans and Zuinglians, that the Churches of Christ would lay aside their controversies in that matter, and agree and unite in a Christian concord together, that they might propagate one sound pure doctrine, consonant to the discipline of the primitive Church; and this would be the way to convert even Turks themselves to the obedience of the Gospel. But I recommend the reader to the archbishop's own letter to the said Vadianus; wherein he may see how fast and firm he stuck to this doctrine in these days. He will find it in the Appendix.[1]

Sanders, in his lying book of the English schism,[2] would make his reader believe that Cranmer was of this opinion for another reason, namely, because his master King Henry thought so: and that he had so devoted himself to him, that he in all things whatsoever believed, and did, in conformity to him: giving Cranmer therefore the nickname of Henricianus. But we must attribute that suggestion to the well-known venomous pen of that man, who cared not what he writ so he might but throw his dirt upon the Reformation and the Reformers. The said author with the same malice would have it, that Cranmer was very variable and inconstant, having been first for a corporeal presence, afterwards a Lutheran, and then a Calvinist; and that he thus changed his opinion, as a sycophant and flatterer, to comply with every man's humour that was uppermost. That all the time of King Henry, he remained of that king's opinion, who was a vehement enemy to Luther; but when he was dead, he became wholly Lutheran, and put forth a catechism, dedicated to King Edward, and printed it; in which he taught, that every Christian that received the sacrament, either under the bread, or in the bread, or with the bread, certainly received into his mouth the very true body and blood of Christ. But that scarce a month passed, when the wretch (that is his word), understood that the duke of Somerset, the king's governor, was a Calvinist, and not a Lutheran; what should he do? He printed his catechism again, changed the word; and of an Henrician and a Lutheran became a Calvinist.

---

[1] No. XXV.

[2] [The following is the title of the book to which Strype refers:—" Sanderi, vera et sincera Hist. Schismat. Anglic."—Lib. ii. pp. 180, 181, 190.]

But to give a more true and respectful account of our archbishop, as to his continuance in this opinion, and his change of it. Hitherto we have seen his opinion for a corporeal presence. In the next year (viz. 1539), I find one Adam Damplip of Calais, a learned preacher, convented before him, and several other bishops, for not holding the real presence.[1] From which opinion the archbishop, with the rest, did endeavour to bring him off; though then he marvelled much at the answers that Damplip made, and confessed openly and plainly, that the Scripture knew no such term as *transubstantiation*. In the year 1541, he had one Barber, a master of arts of Oxford, brought before him for denying the said corporael presence. The archbishop disputed again earnestly for that doctrine against this man, yet could not but admire at his readiness in citing his places out of St. Augustin, nor could tell how to confute them, as Mr. Raphe Morice, his secretary, related afterward to John Fox.[1] And this tenet he held to the very last year of King Henry, that is, to the year 1546: when, by more mature and calm deliberation, and considering the point with less prejudice, and the sense of the Fathers more closely, in conference with Dr. Ridley, afterwards bishop of Rochester, and his fellow-martyr, he at last quitted and freed himself from the fetters of that unsound doctrine; as appears by the epistle dedicatory before his book of the sacrament in Latin, printed by the exiles at Embden.[2] Which epistle we may give credit to, being written (as is thought), by Sir John Cheke, who well knew the archbishop, and matters relating to him.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 497.]

After Archbishop Cranmer and Ridley had changed their opinion, Latimer not long after changed his in this point; for, as they all three died martyrs at Oxon, I am willing to join them together here. It was but seven years before his burning that he relinquished that old error, that is, about the year 1547, as he confessed to Dr. Weston in his disputation.[3] There is an argument the said Latimer made use of, to prove the deceit of the blood of Hales, which argument supposes him then of this opinion. It was pretended by the priests that none could see this blood, but those that were confessed and absolved by the priest, and so clean in life, and their seeing of it was a sign they were so. But said Latimer in those times, for the exposing of this fraud, "Those wretches that scourged Christ, and nailed him to His cross, did see His blood with their bodily eyes, and yet were not in clean life. And we see the self-same blood in form of wine, when we have consecrated, and may both see it, feel it, and receive it to our damnation, as touching bodily receiving."[4] We shall perhaps say more of the archbishop's opinion on the eucharist, when we come to speak of his book relating to that argument.

Divers priests now, as well religious as secular, had married themselves, after the example of the archbishop, who kept his wife secretly with him. But some of these married priests were so indiscreet, that they lived publicly and openly with their wives, though the ecclesiastical laws were in force against such marriages, nor had they any allowances by the king and realm in Parliament; only some had dispensations (as it is said), from the archbishop. Therefore, the king, pressed by some of the papists about him (who began now, after Lambert's death, to listen to them), set forth a proclamation, November 16, for the stopping of such matrimonies, which ran in this tenor:—

---

[1] Acts and Mon. p. 1101 [Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 454].

[2] [This Epistle is printed in the Parker Society edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. i. Appendix, p. 6.]

[3] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 505.]

[4] Fox, p. 1581 [vol. vii. p. 476].

"That the king's majesty understanding that a few in number of this his realm, being priests, as well religious as other, had taken wives, and married themselves, &c. his highness in no wise minding that the generality of the clergy of this his realm should, with the example of such a few number of light persons, proceed to marriage without a common consent of his highness, and his realm, did therefore straitly charge and command, as well all and singular the said priests as have attempted marriages, that be openly known, as all such as would presumptuously proceed to the same, that they, nor any of them, should minister any sacrament, or other ministry mystical; nor have any office, dignity, cure, privilege, profit, or commodity, heretofore accustomed and belonging to the clergy of this realm, but should be utterly, after such marriages, expelled and deprived from the same, and be had and reputed as lay persons to all intents and purposes. And that such as should after this proclamation, contrary to his commandment, of their presumptuous mind, take wives and be married, should run in his grace's indignation, and suffer further punishment and imprisonment at his grace's will and pleasure. *Dat.* xvi. *Novembris, anno regni sui* xxx."[1]

Wherein we may observe what a particular regard the king had for the archbishop in relation to his wife, that the danger of the proclamation might not reach him, by limiting the penalty, not to such as were married and kept their wives secretly, but to such as should marry hereafter, and such as kept them openly. And we may observe further, that it seemed to be in the king's mind in due time to tolerate marriages to priests by act of Parliament, which that clause seems to import, that these priests had married themselves "without a common consent of his highness and his realm." And Bishop Ponet, or whoever else was the author of the Defence of priests' marriage,[1] assures us that the king intended to permit priests to take wives, knowing how necessary it was to grant that liberty; and he affirms that it was not unknown to divers that heard him speak oft of that matter, but was hindered by some jealous counsellors, that pretended how ill the people would take it, had it been done by his authority.

---

[1] [This Proclamation is printed in Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iii. p. 696, where the date is not "in the 30th," but "the 13th year of our reign."]

The sect of Anabaptists did now begin to pester this Church, and would openly dispute their principles in taverns and public places, and some of them were taken up. Many also of their books were brought in and printed here also, which was the cause that the king now set out a severe proclamation against them and their books. To which he joined the Sacramentaries, as lately with the other came into the land, declaring, "That he abhorred and detested their errors, and that those that were apprehended he would make examples. Ordering that they should be detected, and brought before the king, or his council, and that all that were not should in eight or ten days depart the kingdom. This proclamation may be read in the Appendix, Num. VIII., where I have misplaced it."

A commission also was then given out to the archbishop, to John [Longland] bishop of Lincoln, Richard [Sampson] bishop of Chichester, and others, against this sect, which commission was signed at the bottom by Thomas Crumwel.[2]

It was observed that the parsons, vicars, and curates did read confusedly the word of God, and the king's injunctions, lately set forth, and commanded by them to be read, humming and hawking thereat, that almost no man could understand the meaning of the injunction.[3] And they secretly suborned certain spreaders of rumours and false tales in corners, who interpreted the injunctions to a false sense. And because there was an order that all christenings, marriages, and burials should be registered from time to time, and the books surely kept in the parish churches, they blew abroad, that the king intended to make new exactions at all christenings, weddings, and burials; adding, that therein the king went about to take away the liberties of the realm, for which, they said, Thomas à Becket died. And they bad their parishioners, notwithstanding what they read, being compelled so to do, that they should do as they did in times past, to live as their fathers, and that the old fashion is the best; and other crafty and seditious parables they gave out among them.

---

[1] Defence of Priests' Marriage, p. 198. [See p. 76.]

[2] Cran. Regist.

[3] Cleopat. E. vi. p. 222.

This forced the king to write his letters to the justices of peace, to take up such seditious parsons, vicars, and curates. And in these letters is explained the true reason of Thomas à Becket's contention with King Henry II. As, that he contended, that none of the clergy offending should be called to account, or corrected, but in the bishops' courts only, and not by the laws of the realm; and that no king should be crowned but by the archbishop of Canterbury only.

The church of Hereford being now become vacant by the death of Fox (an excellent instrument of the Reformation), the archbishop committed the custody of the spiritualities to Hugh Coren, doctor of canon laws, and prebendary of that church, and by him visited the church and diocese, and gave certain injunctions to the parsons, vicars, and other curates there. These injunctions, as I find them in Cranmer's Register, were eight in number,[1] which I shall not here insert at large, because they may be met with in the History of the Reformation.[2] But in short, they enjoined the observation of the king's injunctions, given by his majesty's commissaries in the year 1536. They enjoined that they should have, by the first of August, a whole Bible in Latin and English, or at least a New Testament in the same languages; that they should every day study one chapter of the Bible or Testament, conferring the Latin and English together, and to begin at the beginning of the book, and so continue to the end. That they should not discourage any laymen from reading the Bible, but encourage them to it, and to read it for the reformation of their lives, and knowledge of their duty; and not to be bold and presumptuous in judging of things before they have perfect knowledge. That they should, both in their preachings and confessions, and in other their doings, excite their parishioners unto such works as are commanded by God expressly, adding, that for this God should demand of them a strict reckoning, and to teach them that other works, which they do of their own devotion, are not to be so highly esteemed as the other, and that for the not doing them, God will not ask any account. That no friar have any cure or service in their churches, unless he were dispensed withal and licensed by the ordinary. That they admit no young person to the sacrament, who never received it before, unless such person openly in the church, after mass upon a holy-day, say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. That they twice a quarter declare the bands of matrimony, and the danger of using their bodies, but with such persons as they might by the law of God; and that no privy contracts be made, as they would avoid the extreme peril of the laws of the realm."

---

[1] Cran. Regist.

[2] Part i. book iii. Collect. 12 [vol. i. part ii. b. iii. No. 12, p. 285].

No diocesan bishop consecrated this year.

Bishops Suffragans.

Robert [Warton] bishop of St. Asaph recommended to the king John Bradley, abbot of the monastery of Milton, of the order of St. Benedict, or William Pelles, both bachelors of divinity, to the dignity of suffragan, within the diocese [province rather] of Canterbury, mentioning no particular see. The bishop of Bath and Wells [Clerk] also recommended two to the king, out of which to nominate a suffragan to some see within the province of Canterbury, viz. William Finch, late prior of Bremar, and Richard Walshe, prior of the hospital of St. John Baptist, of Bridgewater.[1]

April the 7th, William Finch was nominated by the king to the archbishop, to be consecrated for suffragan of Taunton; and then consecrated in the chapel of St. Mary's, in the conventual church of the Friars Preachers, London, by John [Hilsey] bishop of Rochester, by virtue of letters commissional from the archbishop, Robert [Warton] bishop of St. Asaph, and William suffragan of Colchester, assisting. And,

---

[1] Cran. Regist.

March the 23rd, John Bradley was consecrated suffragan of Shaftsbury, in the chancel of the parish church of St. John Baptist, in Southampton, by John [Salcot] bishop of Bangor, by the letters commissional of Thomas archbishop of Canterbury, John Ipolitanen., and Thomas suffragan of Marlborough, assisting.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Act of Six Articles.

THIS year, October the 6th, I meet with a commission, *ad facultates*, granted from the archbishop to a famous man, Nicholas Wotton, LL.D., a man of great learning, and made use of by the king afterwards in divers embassies, and a privy counsellor to King Henry, and his three children, successively princes of the realm, and dean of Canterbury and York.[1] This commission was in pursuance of a late act of Parliament, to this tenor; that in whatsoever cases, not prohibited by divine right, in which the bishop of Rome, or Roman see, heretofore accustomed to dispense, and also in all other cases, in which the bishop or see of Rome accustomed not to dispense, if so be they were not forbid by divine right; in these cases the archbishop had power granted him to dispense. In this office he constituted Wotton his commissary or deputy, for the term of his natural life. He succeeded Edmund Bonner, master of the archbishop's faculties, now preferred to the bishopric of Hereford.[2] So that Cranmer took notice of the merits of this man, who was so much made use of afterwards in the Church and State; and was of that great esteem and reputation, that he was thought on, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, for archbishop of Canterbury. In the year 1528, he was doctor of laws, and the bishop of London's official. In the year 1540, he was resident for the king in the duke of Cleves' court, and had been employed in the match between the king and the Lady Ann of that house the year before, and perhaps this might be the first time he was sent abroad in the king's business.

---

[1] Cran. Regist.

[2] [Wood's] Ath. Oxon. p. 124 [vol. i. pp. 368—370].

In the year 1539, the king took occasion to be displeased with the archbishop and the other bishops "of the new learning," as they then termed them, because they could not be brought to give their consent in the Parliament, that the king should have all the monasteries suppressed to his own sole use. They were willing he should have all the lands as his ancestors gave to any of them, but the residue they would have had bestowed upon hospitals, grammar-schools for the bringing up of youth in virtue and good learning, with other things profitable in the commonwealth. The king was hereunto stirred by the crafty insinuations of [Gardiner] the bishop of Winchester, and other old dissembling papists.[1] And as an effect of this displeasure, as it was thought, in the Parliament this year, he made the terrible bloody act of the Six Articles, whereby none were suffered to speak a word against the doctrine of transubstantiation upon pain of being burnt to death as an heretic, and to forfeit all his lands and goods, as in case of treason. And, moreover, it was made felony, and forfeiture of lands and goods, to defend the communion in both kinds, marriage in a priest, or in any man or woman that had vowed chastity; or to say anything against the necessity of private masses and auricular confession. Which Articles were plainly enough designed against any that should dare to open their mouths against these Romish errors, and especially to impose silence, and that on pain of death, upon many honest preachers that were now risen up, and used to speak freely against these abuses; and as a good means to keep the poor people still securely in their old ignorance and superstition.

But before this act passed, marvellous great struggling there was on both parts, for and against it. But the side of the favourers of the Gospel at this time was the weaker, the king now inclining more to the other party, for the reason abovesaid, and for other causes, wherein I refer the reader to the conjectures of the Lord Herbert.[2] The bishops disputed long in the house, some for it, and some against it. The archbishop disputed earnestly three days against it, using divers arguments to dissuade passing the act, which were so remarkable for the learning and weight of them, that the king required a copy of them. And though he was resolved not to alter his purpose of having this act made, yet he was not offended with the archbishop's freedom, as knowing the sincerity of the man. Even those in the house that dissented from him were greatly taken with the gravity, eloquence, and learning he then showed, and particularly the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk; who told him so at his table soon after, being sent by the king to him to comfort him under his dejection for this act, with Crumwel, and many other lords. The papist writers say he opposed it because himself was a married man, and so it would touch him close; but it is plain that there were other of these Six Articles which he utterly disliked; and especially he abhorred the rigorous penalty of the act. But hereupon he privately sent away his wife into Germany among her friends. On this side also were, beside the archbishop, the bishops of Ely [Goodrich], Sarum [Shaxton], Worcester [Latimer], Rochester [Hilsey], and St. David's [Barlow]; York [Lee], Durham [Tunstal], Winchester [Gardiner], and Carlisle [Aldrich], went vigorously the other way. Against the former the king himself argued, with his learning, out of the Scriptures, and would by all means prove these Articles thence. The Parliament men said little against this bill, but seemed all unanimous for it; neither did the Lord Chancellor Audley, no, nor the Lord Privy Seal, Crumwel, speak against it: the reason being, no question, because they saw the king so resolved upon it. Nay, it came to be a flying report that the archbishop of Canterbury himself, and all the bishops, except Sarum, consented. But this is not likely that Cranmer, who had so openly and zealously opposed it, should be so soon changed, and brought to comply with it. Nay, at the very same time it passed, he stayed and protested against it, though the king desired him to go out, since he could not consent to it. Worcester also, as well as Sarum, was committed to prison; and he, as well as the other, resigned up his bishopric upon the act.

---

[1] Life of Cranm. inter Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxvii. 91].

[2] Life of King Henry, p. 512.

In the foresaid disputation in the Parliament house, the archbishop behaved himself with such humble modesty, and obedience in word towards his prince, protesting the cause not to be his, but God's; that neither his enterprise was misliked of the king, and his allegations and reasons were so strong, that they could not be refuted. Great pity it is, that these arguments of the archbishop are lost, which I suppose they are irrecoverably, because Fox, that lived so near those times, and so elaborate a searcher after such papers, could not meet with them; and all that he could do was to wish that they were extant to be seen and read.[1] However, I will make my conjecture here, that I am apt to think that one of the main matters insisted on by him at this time was against the cruel penalty annexed to these Articles. For I find in one of the archbishop's manuscript volumes, now in Benet College library, there is in this very year a discourse in Latin upon this subject, "Num in hæreticos jure magistratui gravius animadvertere liceat: Decisio Urbani Rhegii, Interprete Jacobo Gisleno. Anno 1539," which book I suppose he might at this juncture have read over, and made use of.

The dukes and lords of Parliament, that, as above was said, came over to Lambeth to visit and dine with him, by the king's command, used words to him to this tenor:—"The king's pleasure is, that we should in his behalf cherish and comfort you, as one that for your travail in the late Parliament declared yourself both greatly learned, and also discreet and wise; and therefore, my lord, be not discouraged for anything that passed there contrary to your allegations." The archbishop replied, "In the first place, my lords, I heartily thank the king's highness for his singular good affection towards me, and you all, for your pains. And I hope in God, that hereafter my allegations and authorities shall take place, to the glory of God, and commodity of the realm." Every of the lords brought forth his sentence in commendation of him, to show what good-will both the king and they bare to him. One of them entered into a comparison between the said archbishop and Cardinal Wolsey, preferring the archbishop before him for his mild and gentle nature; whereas, he said, the cardinal was a stubborn and churlish prelate, that could never abide any nobleman. The Lord Crumwel, as Cranmer's secretary relates,[1] who himself heard the words, "You, my lord," said he, "were born in an happy hour I suppose; for do or say what you will, the king will always take it well at your hands. And I must needs confess, that in some things I have complained of you to his majesty, but all in vain, for he will never give credit against you, whatsoever is laid at your charge; but let me, or any other of the council, be complained of, his grace will most seriously chide, and fall out with us; and therefore you are most happy, if you can keep you in this state."

---

[1] [Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 362.]

The Roman zealots, having obtained this act of the Six Articles, desisted not, but seconded their blow by a book of "Ceremonies to be used by the Church of England," so intituled, all running after the old Popish strain. It proceeded all along in favour of the Roman Church's superstitious ceremonies, endeavouring to show the good signification of them. The book first begins with an index of the points touched therein, viz. "churches and churchyards, the hallowing aud reconciling them. The ceremonies about the sacrament of baptism. Ordering of the ministers of the Church in general. Divine service to be sung and said in the church. Matins, prime and other hours. Ceremonies used in the mass. Sundays, with other feasts. Bells. Vesture and tonsure of the ministers of the church, and what service they be bound unto. Bearing candles upon Candlemas-day. Fasting days. The giving of ashes. The covering of the cross and images in Lent. Bearing of palms. The service of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday before Easter. The hallowing of oil and chrism. The washing of the altars. The hallowing of the font upon Saturday in the Easter-even. The ceremonies of the resurrection in Easter-morning. General and other particular processions. Benedictions of bells or priests. Holy water, and holy bread. A general doctrine to what intent ceremonies be ordained, and of what value they be." The book itself is too long to be here inserted; but such as have the curiosity may find it in the Cotton Library,[2] and may observe what pains was taken to smooth and varnish over the old superstitions. I do not find this book mentioned by any of our historians. [Gardiner], the bishop of Winchester, with his own pen, hath an annotation in the margin of one place in the book, and I strongly suspect he was more than the reviser of it; and that it was drawn up by him and his party, and strongly pushed on to be owned as the act of the clergy, for this year there was a Convocation. The king had sent his letters, written March the 12th, in the 30th year of his reign, viz. 1538, to the archbishop of Canterbury, for summoning a Convocation, to meet together at St. Paul's, the second day of May. But this assembly, by the king's letters to him, was prorogued till November the 4th. At this Convocation, I suppose, these Articles were invented and propounded to the house. All this long book, in behalf of the ceremonies, did our laborious metropolitan put himself to the pains of answering, and thereby hindered the reception of it, for concerning this I do interpret that passage of Fox, viz. That the archbishop confuted eighty-eight articles devised by a Convocation, and which were laboured to be received, but were not.[1] But to return to the Six Articles.

---

[1] MS. Life of Cranmer, in C.C.C.C.

[2] Cleopatra. E. v. p. 259.

Great triumphing now there was on the papists' side, as appears by a letter wrote from some Roman Catholic member of the House of Lords to his friend; which may be read in the Appendix.[2] But after some time, the king perceiving that the said archbishops and bishops did this thing, not of malice or stubbornness, but out of a zeal they had to God's glory and the commonwealth, reformed in part the said Six Articles, and somewhat blunted the edge of them.[3]

March 20, two commissions were sent to the archbishop to take the surrender of two houses of religious persons; namely, that of Christ's Church, Canterbury, and that of Rochester.

Towards the latter end of this year several new bishoprics were founded out of old monasteries; and several deaneries and colleges of prebends out of divers priories belonging to cathedral churches. Herein as Crumwel, so Cranmer had a great hand; who laboured with the king that in these new foundations there should be readers of Divinity, Greek, and

---

[1] Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. p. 36.]

[2] No. XXVI.

[3] [This mitigation took place A.D. 1543, by a decree of Parliament. See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. pp. 526, 527.]

Hebrew, and students trained up in religion and learning; from whence, as a nursery, the bishops should supply their dioceses with honest and able ministers; and so every bishop should have a college of clergymen under his eye, to be preferred according to their merits; for it was our archbishop's regret that the prebendaries were bestowed as they were. This complaint Bishop Burnet tells us he saw in a long letter of Cranmer's own hand.[1]

Bishops confirmed.

In Archbishop Cranmer's Register I find these bishops confirmed, their consecrations being omitted.

August the 11th, John Bell, LL.D., brought up in Baliol College, and archdeacon of Gloucester, was confirmed bishop of Worcester, upon the resignation of Bishop Latimer, in the chapel of Lambeth. He is styled in the Register, the "King's Chaplain and Councellor."

November the [20th] John Skyp, D.D., archdeacon of Dorset, and once chaplain to Queen Ann Boleyn, was confirmed bishop of Hereford. The king's letter to the archbishop to consecrate him bears date November 8.

CHAPTER XX.

The Archbishop in commission.

The next year, viz. 1540, the archbishop lost his great friend and assistant in carrying on the Reformation; I mean the Lord Crumwel. And when he was, by popish craft and malice, taken off, their next work was to sacrifice Cranmer. And many were the accusations that were put up against him; and trial was made many ways to bring him to his death, or at least to bring him in disgrace with the king.

And first, they thought to compass their ends against him by occasion of a commission now issued out from the king to a select number of bishops, whereof the archbishop was one (which commission was confirmed by act of Parliament), for inspecting into matters of religion, and explain-ing some of the chief doctrines of it. These commissioners had drawn up a set of articles, favouring the old popish superstitions; and meeting together at Lambeth they produced them, and vehemently urged that they should be established, and that the archbishop would yield to the allowance of them, especially seeing there was a signification, that it was the king's will and pleasure that the articles should run in that tenor. But they could not win the archbishop neither by fear nor flattery; no, though the Lord Crumwel at this very time lay in the Tower. There was not one commissioner now on his part, but all shrank away, and complied with the time; and even those he most trusted to, viz. Bishop Hethe, of Rochester; and Bishop Skyp, of Hereford. The archbishop, as he disliked the book already drawn up by them, so he presented another book, wherein were divers amendments of theirs. After much arguing and disputing, nor could the archbishop be brought off, Hethe and Skyp, with a friend or two more, walked down with him into his garden at Lambeth, and there used all the persuasion they could, urging to him that the king was resolved to have it so, and the danger therefore of opposing it. But he honestly persisted in his constancy, telling them, "that there was but one truth in the Articles to be concluded upon, which, if they hid from his majesty, by consenting unto a contrary doctrine, his highness would, in process of time perceive the truth, and see how colourably they had dealt with him. And he knew, he said, his grace's nature so well, that he would never after credit and trust them. And they being both his friends, he bad them beware in time, and discharge their consciences in maintenance of the truth."[1] But though nothing of all this could stir them, yet what he said sufficiently confirmed the archbishop to persist in his resolution.

---

[1] Hist. Ref. part 1, p. 301 [vol. iii. part 1, pp. 269—271].

The archbishop, standing thus alone, went himself to the king, and so wrought with him that his majesty joined with him against all the rest of them; and the book of Articles passed on his side. When, indeed, this stiffness of Canterbury was the very thing his enemies desired, thinking that for this oppression the king would certainly have thrown him into the Tower; and many wagers were laid in London about it. So that this ended in two good issues; that the archbishop's enemies were clothed with shame and disappointment, and a very good book, chiefly of the archbishop's composing, came forth for the instruction of the people, known by the name of "A Necessary Erudition of any Christian Man," a particular account whereof may be read in the History of the Reformation.[1] This vexed Winchester to the heart, that his plot took no better effect; but he put it up till he should find other opportunities to attack him, which after happened, as we shall see in the sequel of this story.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. pp. 23, 24.]

But this matter deserves to be a little more particularly treated of; the king had, as was said before, appointed several of the eminent divines of his realm to deliberate about sundry points of religion then in the controversy, and to give in their sentences distinctly. And that in regard of the Germans, who the last year had sent over in writing the judgment of their divines respecting some articles of religion; and had offered his majesty to appoint some of their divines to meet some others of the king's, in any place he should assign; or to come over into England to confer together. And also in regard of a more exact review of the "Institution of a Christian Man," put forth about two or three years before, and now intended to be published again, as a more perfect piece of religious instruction for the people. The king, therefore, being minded thoroughly to sift divers points of religion, then started and much controverted, commanded a particular number of bishops, and other his learned chaplains and dignitaries, to compare the rites and ceremonies, and tenets of the present Church, by the Scriptures, and by the most ancient writers; and to see how far the Scripture, or good antiquity, did allow the same. And this I suppose he did by the instigation of Archbishop Cranmer.

The names of the commissioners were these; Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury; Lee, archbishop of York; Bonner, bishop of London; Tunstal, bishop of Durham; Barlow, bishop of St. David's; Aldrich, bishop of Carlisle; Skyp, bishop of Hereford; Hethe, bishop of Rochester; Thirleby, bishop elect of Westminster; Doctors, Cox, Robinson, Day,

---

[1] Hist. Ref. part i. p. 286 [vol. i. p. 572].

Oglethorp, Redman, Edgeworth, Symonds, Tresham, Leyghton, Curwen, Crayford; where we may wonder not to see the name of the bishop of Winton.[1] But if we consider the reason the king gave why he left him out of the number of his executors, viz. because (as he told several noblemen then about him), that bishop was a turbulent wilful man; and if he were joined with them, they should have no quiet in their consultations. The same reason we may conclude moved the king now, in these deliberations about religion, to lay him aside. These persons were generally learned and moderate men, and such as we may conjecture the archbishop had the nomination of to the king; however, we may be sure Winchester was not idle at this time.

And first the doctrine of the sacraments was examined, by propounding seventeen distinct questions, drawn up, as I have reason to conclude, by the archbishop, on which the divines were to consult: but each one was to set down in writing his sense of every of these questions singly and succinctly. These questions are the same with those in the History of the Reformation. The right reverend author[2] hath set down there the several answers that those bishops and divines, that he met with in Bishop Stillingfleet's manuscript, made to each question; which I shall not now repeat after him. But I find in a Cotton book a few pages that deserve (according to my poor judgment) to be transcribed, of something which is not in that history, being the answers of other bishops and divines in the same commission.[3] The

---

[1] Whereas I had said, that [Gardiner] the bishop of Winchester was not in a commission there specified; it appears by Crumwel's speech, set down by the bishop of Sarum, that that bishop was then indeed a commissioner.* Here my MS. deceived me. But be it noted what the Lord Paget testified before the commissioners at that bishop's trial in 1549; namely, that because he was so wilful in his opinion, and addicted to the Popish part, the king left him out of the commission for compiling the last book of religion. And what that book was I know not unless the "Necessary Erudition."† [*From the Errata and Emendations to the first Edition.*]

[2] Part. i. Collect. 21, p. 201 [vol. i. part ii. b. iii. No. 21, pp. 314—369].

[3] Cleopatra, E. v. p. 36.

---

* Hist. Reform. v. i. p. 274 [vol. i. p. 550].

† Acts and Mon. first edit. p. 815 [vol. vi. p. 163].

first is nameless; but for some reasons I believe him to be [Tunstal] the bishop of Durham. Each page consisteth of three columns; the middle column contains the questions. On one side-column is writ his answer to each question; on the other side-column are the king's notes upon the answer. wrote by his own hand. I refer the reader to the Appendix for this.[1] There follow in the Cotton book, solutions of each of these questions by another, omitted by the bishop of Sarum in his history. He is nameless also, but appears to have been some popishly-affected bishop, but yet one that conversed much with the archbishop, [Barlow] the bishop of St. David's, and Dr. Cox, and was, I suppose, Thirlby, elect of Westminster: for in many places in the margin of his paper are set the names of those men; for what purpose I do not know, unless to signify their judgments as agreeable with his; though in these very places sometimes their minds and his differ. This man's answer also was perused by the king, who sometimes writ his own objections in the margin. This also I have cast into the Appendix.[2]

In the conclusion of this famous consultation upon these seventeen articles concerning the sacraments (their resolutions being drawn up in writing under their own hands), the archbishop, having these discourses given into his hand for the king's use, drew up a summary of each man's judgment; which, together with his own, he caused to be written fairly out by his secretary, and so presented to the king. The bishop of Sarum hath saved me the trouble of writing them out in this work, having presented them already to the world in his history,[3] from another manuscript than the Cotton book which I make use of, which is a true original.[4] The archbishop's summary may be found among the collections in the said history, against the word *Agreement* in the margin, and the archbishop's own judgment against his name in the margin. At the conclusion of his paper, which he sent to the king, he subscribed thus, most warily and modestly, with his own hand :—

---

[1] No. XXVII.

[2] No. XXVIII.

[3] Vol. i. book iii. Collect. 21 [vol. i. part ii. b. ii. No. 21, pp. 314—369].

[4] Cleopatra, E. v. [53].

> "*T. Cantuarien.*—This is mine opinion and sentence at this present; which nevertheless I do not temerariously define, but refer the judgment thereof unto your majesty."[1]

Besides these seventeen questions, there are in this choice Cottonian manuscript divers others propounded to another combination of bishops and divines,[1] perhaps about this time, or rather, I conceive, three years before, with their answers under their hands thereunto, being called together in order to the composing the book called "The Institution." As, concerning confirmation; whether this sacrament be a sacrament of the New Testament, instituted by Christ, or not? What is the outward sign, and invisible grace, that is conferred in the same? What promises be made, that the said graces shall be received by this sacrament? The bishop of Sarum hath printed among his collections[1] the resolutions of the archbishop of Canterbury and [Stokesley] bishop of London to these queries; having taken them out of this manuscript volume which I use. But there be here the opinions of many more, both bishops and other dignitaries of the Church: as namely, [Lee] the archbishop of York, the bishops of Ely [Goodrich], Rochester [Hilsey], Lincoln [Longland], Bangor [Salcot], and Sarum [Shaxton]. Then follows the opinion of the bishop of London, and next of the archbishop of Canterbury. Then come the judgments of Dr. Wotton, dean of Canterbury;[2] Dr. Barber,[3] archdeacon of Cleveland, and warden of All Souls, Oxon, and one of the convocation in 1562: Dr. Bell, a civilian, employed in the king's business against Queen Katherine, archdeacon of Gloucester, and soon after bishop of Worcester; Dr. Wolman, dean of Wells; Dr. Marshall, archdeacon of Nottingham; Dr. Cliff, treasurer of the church of York; Dr. Edmunds, the same, I suppose, that was Master of Peter House, Cambridge; Dr. Downs, chancellor of the church of York; Dr. Marmaduke, the same probably that was called Marmaduke Waldeby; Dr. Robinson, for Robertson, I suppose, archdeacon of Leicester; Dr. Smith, he probably that was professor of divinity in Oxon; Dr. Buckmaster, and another nameless.

---

[1] [Cotton MSS. Cleopatra, E. v. 73. See also Burnet's Hist. of Reformat. vol. i. part ii. "Addenda," iii. pp. 479, 480.]

[2] [See cap. xix. p. 103.]

[3] [For "Barber," read "Warner;" Strype having mistaken the name in transcribing from the Cotton MS.]

And as these learned men treated of this point of confirmation, so, by the various heads and discourses I meet with here, they all gave their judgments of divers other chief points of religion; as *De fide*, *De salvatione*, *De matrimonio*, *De pœnitentia*, *De sacramentorum usu*, and *De auriculari confessione:* where is a letter of the king's own writing, in answer to somewhat [Tunstal] the bishop of Durham had writ upon that argument. This royal letter the bishop of Sarum hath printed in his History.[1] "Of Priests' marriage;" whereof the king wrote a short discourse. "Of Pilgrimages; Of Purgatory;" of this there is a discourse wrote by Latimer: and after follows another by the king. Latimer's discourse is animadverted upon by the king's pen in the margin; *De utraque specie.* Three or four large discourses thereupon in favour of receiving in one kind: one whereof was part of the king's answer to the German ambassadors that were sent hither about a treaty in the years 1538 and 1539. The second is part of an apology, by an English divine, to those German Protestants, for communion in one kind, and for private mass. And this latter probably is the bishop of Durham's, because the correction of the paper (transcribed, as it seems, by his secretary), here and there is his own hand.

So that some of these discourses were, I make no doubt, drawn up by the divines for the king's use, in order to his answer to the writing which the German agents the last year had composed, before their voyage home. But these papers, some English and some Latin, are so large, that they would too much swell this volume, and entangle the thread of the discourse, if I should here insert them: and therefore I must omit them, and proceed to other matters.

In this thirty-second year of the king, by a seasonable law, a stop was put to an evil that now mightily prevailed: namely, the frequency of divorces. For it was ordinary to annul marriages, and divide man and wife from each other, who it may be had lived long together, and had children in wedlock: when, upon any disgust of man or wife, they would withdraw from one another; and so in effect make their children bastards, upon pretence of some pre-contract or affinity: which by the Pope's law required a divorce. The king himself took particular care of this act, and there were two rough drafts of it, which I have seen in the Cotton Library: both which he himself revised diligently, and corrected with his own pen. These divorces the archbishop highly disliked; and might probably have laid before the king the great inconveniences, as well as scandal, thereof. It troubled him to see how common these divorces were grown in Germany, and after-marriages, and bigamy. There is a letter of his to Osiander, the German divine, concerning matrimony, in what year written appeareth not, unless perhaps in this year, or the following, now that the king was employing his thoughts about redress of this business. The sum of the letter is to desire Osiander to supply him with an answer to some things that seemed to reflect a fault upon those in Germany that professed the Gospel; and that was, that they allowed such as were divorced to marry again, both parties divorced being alive: and that they suffered, without any divorce, a man to have more wives than one. And Osiander had acknowledged as much expressly to Cranmer, in a letter, seeming to complain of it, and added, that Philip Melancthon himself was present at one of these marriages of a second wife, the first being alive.

---

[1] Part i. Addenda to the Collect. No. 11 [vol. i. part ii. "Addenda," No. 11, pp. 547—550].

Indeed if anything were done among these Protestants that seemed not just and fair, to be sure Cranmer should presently be twitted in the teeth with it. And then he was fain to make the best answers he could, either out of their books, or out of his own invention. And he was always asked about the affairs in those parts. And sometimes he was forced to confess some things, and be ready to blush at them (such a concern had he for Germany), as concerning their allowance of usury, and of concubines to their noblemen; as he wrote to the said German. But I will not longer detain the reader from perusing the excellent learned letter of the archbishop, which he may find in the Appendix, concerning this subject.[1]

---

[1] No. XXIX.

CHAPTER XXI.

The largest Bible printed.

The largest English Bible coming forth in print this year, wherein our archbishop, out of his zeal to God's glory had so great an influence, I shall here take occasion to give some account of the translation of, as well as I can; there having been no exact story thereof anywhere given, as I know of.

The first time the Holy Scripture was printed in English (for written copies thereof of Wickliff's translation, there were long before, and many), was about the year 1526. And that was only the New Testament, translated by Tindal, assisted by Joy and Constantine, and printed in some foreign parts, I suppose at Hamburgh or Antwerp. For in this year I find that Cardinal Wolsey and the bishops consulted together for the prohibiting the New Testament, of Tindal's translation to be read. And Tunstal bishop of London issued out his commission to his archdeacons for calling in the New Testament.[1] This year also Tunstal and Sir Thomas More bought up almost the whole impression, and burnt them at Paul's Cross. I think it was this first edition that Garret, alias Garrerd, curate of Honey-lane, afterwards burnt for heresy, dispersed in London and Oxford.[2]

Soon after Tindal revised his translation of the New Testament, and corrected it, and caused it again to be printed about the year 1530. The books finished were privily sent over to Tindal's brother, John Tindal, and Thomas Patmore, merchants, and another young man; who received them, and dispersed them. For which having been taken up by [Stokesley] the bishop of London, they were adjudged in the Star Chamber, Sir Thomas More being then lord chancellor, to ride with their faces to the horse's tail, having papers on their heads, and the New Testaments and other books (which they dispersed), to be fastened thick about them, pinned or tacked to their gowns or cloaks, and at the standard in Cheap, themselves to throw them into a fire made for that purpose; and then to be fined at the king's pleasure. Which penance they observed. The fine set upon them was heavy enough, viz. eighteen thousand eight hundred and forty pounds and tenpence: as was extant to be seen in the records of the Star Chamber.

---

[1] Fox's Acts, p. 929 [vol. iv. p. 666].

[2] [Garret was burned at Oxford, July 28, 1540, with William Jerome, vicar of Stepney, and Robert Barnes. See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 438. Honey-lane was immediately opposite the church of St. Mary of the Arches, commonly called "Bow Church," in Cheapside, where the City of London School now stands. The church of which Garret was curate was destroyed at the Great Fire.]

Anno 1531, the bishops came into the Star Chamber, and communing with the king's counsel, and alleging that this Testament was not truly translated, and that in it were prologues and prefaces of heresy and raillery against bishops; upon this complaint the Testament, and other such like books, were prohibited. But the king gave commandment to the bishops at the same time, that they calling to them the best learned out of the universities, should cause a new translation to be made; so that the people might not be ignorant in the law of God, But the bishops did nothing in obedience to this commandment.[1]

The same year, viz. 1531, in the month of May, Stokesley, bishop of London (as Tunstal, his predecessor, had done four or five years before), caused all the New Testaments of Tindal, and many other books which he had bought up, to be brought to Paul's churchyard, and there openly burnt.[2]

In the year 1537, the Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, called Matthews' Bible, of Tindal's and Rogers' translation, was printed by Grafton and Whitchurch at Hamburgh, to the number of fifteen hundred copies. Which book obtained then so much favour of the king, by Crumwel's and Canterbury's means, that the king enjoined it to be had by all curates, and set up in all parish churches throughout the realm. It was done by one John Rogers, who flourished a great while in Germany, and was superintendent of a church there; being afterwards a prebend of St. Paul's, and the first martyr in Queen Mary's days. He is said by my author to have translated the Bible into English from Genesis to the end of the Revelations, making use of the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, and English [that is, Tindal's] copies. He added prefaces, and notes out of Luther; and dedicated the whole book to King Henry, under the name of Thomas Matthews, by an epistle prefixed; minding to conceal his own name.[1] Grafton, and the rest of the merchants concerned in the work, thinking that they had not stock enough to supply all the nation, and this book being of a volume not large enough, and considering the prologues and marginal notes gave offence to some, and being put on by those that favoured the Gospel, that as many as possible could be might be printed, for the dispersing the knowledge of Christ and his truth; they resolved to imprint it again, which they intended should be of a larger volume than any before, and therefore it was called, when it came forth, "The Bible in the largest volume." They intended also, in order to this edition, to have the former translation revised, and to omit several prologues and annotations. And Miles Coverdale was the man now that compared the translation with the Hebrew, and mended it in divers places, and was the chief overseer of the work. But though they left out Matthews', that is, Rogers' notes, yet they resolved to make hands and marks on the sides of the book; which meant, that they would have particular notice to be taken of those places, being such texts as did more especially strike at the errors and abuses of the Romish church.

---

[1] Fox, p. 937 [vol. iv. p. 696].

[2] [Strype is in error in attributing the burning of the New Testament and other books to Stokesley, who was then at Bologna, though bishop of London elect on Tunstal's translation to Durham, on Henry VIII.'s business. The act was therefore Tunstal's.]

Grafton resolved to print this Bible in Paris, if he could obtain leave, there being better paper and cheaper to be had in France, and more dexterous workmen. For this purpose the Lord Crumwel, who stood by him in his enterprise, procured letters of the king, as Fox relates, to Francis, the French king, which were conveyed to Bonner, then ambassador at that court, for him to present them to the king. The contents of which letters to the King Francis were to this effect: "For a subject of his to imprint the Bible in English in his dominion, both in regard of his paper and workmen." The king at the same time wrote to his said ambassador to aid and assist the undertakers of this good work in all their reasonable suits. Bonner did not only present this letter to Francis, and obtained with good words the license desired, but he showed great friendship to the merchants and printers, and so encouraged them, that the work went on with good speed and success. And to show how well affected he was now to the Holy Bible, he caused the English there in Paris to print the New Testament in English and Latin, and took off a great many of them himself, and distributed them to his friends.[1] But the principle that moved Bonner in all this was, that he might the better curry favour with Crumwel, and recommend himself to him, who, being the great favourite now with the king, was the fittest instrument for his rise. The letters patent that Bonner procured of the French king for the printing this Bible may be seen in the Appendix;[2] wherein indeed I do not find any specification of King Henry's letters to Francis, but only mention made that he had sufficient testimony that the said Henry had allowed them to print the Bible as well in Latin as English, and, being finished, to bring the impression safely over.

---

[1] Balei Centur. [Script. Illust. Catal. p. 676].

But notwithstanding this royal license, such was the overswaying authority of the Inquisition in Paris, that the printers were had up into the said Inquisition. For in the year 1538 there was an instrument dated December the 17th, coming from Henry Garvais, S. Th. D., prior of the convent of the Friars Preachers, Paris, and vicar-general of the venerable father Friar Matthew Ory, of the same order, and D.D., inquisitor-general of heretical pravity in the whole kingdom of France, by apostolical and regal authority especially deputed; setting forth,[3] "That since from the translation of the sacred Scriptures, as well of the Old Testament as New, into the mother-tongue, which cometh to the hands of the simple, it is found in these last days that some have taken occasion of error in the faith; and that it is provided by edicts of the supreme court of Parliament, that none should print the Old and New Testament in his mother-tongue, or sell it being printed; and that it was known to him, that one Francis Regnault, a bookseller of the city of Paris, in those days did print the Bible in the vulgar Britannic, or English language; by reason of which, scandals and errors might arise in the Church; therefore he gave out his order to all priests, vicars, curates, &c. to cite the said F. Regnault, and all other that it might concern, to answer, &c.; and to inhibit them under canonical pains to imprint the said Bible, nor to make away, or conceal, from him or his possession, the sheets that are already printed, unless they were seen by him, and otherwise appointed. Dated at Paris, under the seal used in such cases, and the sign manual of the notary public, or sworn scribe of the said holy Inquisition.—LE TELLIER."

---

[1] Fox, p. 1086 [Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 410].

[2] No. XXX.

[3] Cleopatra, E. v. [326].

But before this happened, they were gone through even to the last part of the work. And then great troubles arose; the printer was sent for by the inquisitors, and charged with certain articles of heresy; and the Englishmen likewise that were at the cost and charges hereof, and the corrector Coverdale. Therefore finding it not safe to tarry any longer, they fled away as fast as they could, leaving behind them all their Bibles, the impression consisting of five and twenty hundred in number, which were seized. And if you would know what was done with them, the lieutenant-criminal caused them to be burnt in Maubert-place, as heretical books. Only a few escaped, the lieutenant selling them for waste paper to a haberdasher, being about four dry-fats full. But, however, not long after the English that were concerned in this work, by the encouragement of Crumwel, went back to Paris again, and got the presses, letters, and printing-servants, and brought them over to London, and so became printers themselves, which before they never intended. And so at length in this year, 1540, they successively printed off the Bible of the largest volume; and after that, there were sundry other impressions also.

To this impression of the Bible, that came forth in these troublesome times, and through extraordinary opposition, the king gave countenance, commanding the buying and setting it up. For as it had been printed about three years before, and Crumwel, the king's vicar-general, in his injunctions in the king's name, had ordered all incumbents of livings to provide one, and to set it up publicly in their churches; so this year the king, by his proclamation in the month of May, did again command that this Bible of the largest volume should be provided by the curates and parishioners of every parish, and set up in their churches. For as yet, notwithstanding the first injunctions, many parishes in the realm were destitute of them; whether it were by reason of the unwillingness of the priests to have the English Bible, or the people to be any ways acquainted with it, for fear it should make them heretics, as their curates told them. He stinted also the time, namely, that it should be everywhere provided before All-saints' day next coming, and that upon a penalty of forty shillings a month, after the said feast, that they should be without it. The said proclamation also set the price at ten shillings a book unbound, and well bound and clasped not above twelve shillings; and charged all ordinaries to take care for the seeing this command of the king the better executed.

And upon this Bonner, being now newly bishop of London, set up six Bibles in certain convenient places of St. Paul's church; together with an admonition to the readers, fastened upon the pillars to which the Bibles were chained, to this tenor: "That whosoever came there to read, should prepare himself to be edified and made the better thereby. That he should join thereunto his readiness to obey the king's injunctions made in that behalf. That he bring with him discretion, honest intent, charity, reverence, and quiet behaviour. That there should no such number meet together there, as to make a multitude. That no exposition be made thereupon, but what is declared in the book itself. That it be not read with noise in time of divine service; or that any disputation or contention be used at it."

But it was not much above two years after that the popish bishops obtained of the king the suppression of the Bible again. For after they had taken off the Lord Crumwel, they made great complaint to the king (their old complaint), of the translation, and of the prefaces: whereas indeed and in truth it was the text itself, rather than the prefaces or translation, that disturbed them. Whereupon it was forbid again to be sold, the bishops promising the king to amend and correct it, but never performed it. And

Grafton was now, so long after, summoned and charged with printing Matthews' Bible: which he, being timorous, made excuses for. Then he was examined about the great Bible, and what the notes were he intended to set thereto. He replied, that he added none to his Bible, when he perceived the king and the clergy not willing to have any. Yet Grafton was sent to the Fleet, and there remained six weeks; and, before he came out, was bound in three hundred pounds that he should neither sell nor imprint any more Bibles, till the king and the clergy should agree upon a translation. And they procured an order from the king that the false translation of Tindal, as they called it, should not be uttered either by printer or bookseller; and no other books to be retained that spoke against the sacrament of the altar: no annotations or preambles to be in Bibles or New Testaments in English (that so they might keep Scripture still as obscure as they could): nor the Bible to be read in the church, and nothing to be taught contrary to the king's instructions. And from henceforth the Bible was stopped during the remainder of King Henry's reign.

But however, for some certain ends, the king restrained now and then the use of the Scriptures, to comply with the importunate suits of the popish bishops; yet his judgment always was for the free use of them among his subjects, and (in order to that) for the translating and printing them. For proof of which, I will recite the words of the translator of Erasmus' Paraphrase upon St. Luke, in his preface[1] thereunto, viz. Nic. Udal, a man of eminency in those days, a canon of Windsor, and a servant unto Queen Katharine, the king's last wife: "His most excellent majesty, from the first day that he wore the imperial crown of this realm, foresaw that, to the executing the premises [viz. to destroy counterfeit religions, and to root up all idolatry done to dead images], it was necessary that his people should be reduced to the sincerity of Christ's religion by knowing of God's word. He considered, that requisite it was his subjects were nursled in Christ by reading the Scriptures, whose knowledge should easily induce them to the clear espying of all the sleights of the Romish juggling. And therefore as soon as might be, his highness, by most wholesome and godly laws, provided that it might be lawful for all his most faithful loving subjects to read the word of God, and the rules of Christ's discipline, which they professed. He provided that the Holy Bible should be set forth in our own vulgar language, to the end that England might the better attain to the sincerity of Christ's doctrine, which they might draw out of the clear fountain and spring of the Gospel."

---

[1] [This preface was dedicated to Queen Catherine, first wife of Henry VIII.]

CHAPTER XXII.

The Archbishop retired

Our archbishop, after the unhappy death of the Lord Crumwel, so excellent an instrument in correcting the abuses of religion, out of sorrow and care of himself, betook himself to more retirement, and greater privacy. For in and after this year 1540, I find nothing in his Register but the acts of confirmations, and elections, and consecrations of bishops, as bishoprics fell vacant; the archbishop very seldom consecrating any himself, but commissioning others by his letters to confirm and consecrate: and nothing to be found a great way on in the Register concerning giving ordinances and injunctions to the diocese or province. And no wonder, for there was now no vicegerent in ecclesiasticals to be ready to hearken to the archbishop's directions and counsels for reforming abuses, and to see them executed in the Church. And his own sorrows, and the troubles he met with in these times from his enemies, made him judge it convenient for him now more warily to conceal himself till better days.

But before the death of Crumwel, when Bonner, bishop elect of London, was to be consecrated, the archbishop probably not liking him, and seeing through him, whatever his pretences were, and therefore declining to have any hand in his preferment, sent his commission in April, to Stephen [Gardiner] bishop of Winchester, Richard [Sampson] bishop of Chichester, Robert [Warton] bishop of St. Asaph, and John [Skyp] bishop of Hertford [*i. e.* Hereford], to consecrate him, which, it is said in the Register, they did accordingly, *per sacri chrismatis unctionem, et manuum suarum impositionem.* In this consecration, the prior and chapter of Canterbury insisted, it seems, upon an ancient privilege of their church, which I do not find in this Register they had at other consecrations done, namely, that the consecration should be celebrated at the church of Canterbury, and at no other church or oratory, without their allowance. And so, in a formal instrument, they gave their license and consent, directed to the archbishop, to proceed to the consecration elsewhere. The letter is from Thomas, the prior, and the chapter of Canterbury; and it ran thus:[1]—

"Licet antiquitus fuerit salubriter ordinatum, hactenusque in et per totam vestram provinciam Cantuariensem inconcusse observatur, quod quilibet suffraganeus ecclesiæ vestræ Cantuariensis memoratæ, in [eadem] vestra ecclesia metropolitana Cantuariensi et non alibi præsentialiter consecrari et benedici [consuevit et] deberet, &c."[2] "Yet they gave their consent that he might be consecrated in any other oratory; but yet so that neither they nor the church received any prejudice, and reserving to themselves a decent cope, as every suffragan of the church of Canterbury, according as his profession was, ought to give to the same church by right and ancient custom; and the rights, liberties, privileges, and other customs of the said church always, and in all things being safe." The renewing of this their old pretended privilege looked like some check to the archbishop, and as though they required of him a sort of dependence on them now more than before; and it showed some secret ill-will towards him, which brake out more openly not long after, as we shall show in the process of our story.

In the Register is also recorded Bonner's oath of fidelity to the king against the bishop of Rome, which I will add here, that men may see with what little affection to the Pope this man was let into the bishopric, which he afterwards made so much use of for him and his usurpations; though thereby he stands upon record for ever for perjury. But the oath was this:—

---

[1] Cran. Regist. [260].

[2] [The remainder of this letter, and the following oath taken by Bonner, are given in the Appendix, No. II. of the Ecclesiastical History, Society's edition, vol. i. pp. 497, 499.]

"Ye shall never consent nor agree, that the bishop of Rome shall practise, exercise, or have any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power within this realm, or any other the king's dominions, but that ye shall resist the same at all times to the uttermost of your powers; and that from henceforth ye shall accept, repute, and take the king's majesty to be the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, &c. So help you God, all saints, and the holy Evangelists."

Signed thus;

✠ *In fidem præmissorum Ego* Edmundus Boneir *elect. et confirmat.* Londonien. *huic præsenti chartæ subscripsi.*

By the archbishop's letter, bearing date May 20, he made Robert Harvey, B.LL., his commissary in Calais, and in all the other neighbouring places in France, being his diocese; a man surely wherein the good archbishop was mistaken, or else he would never have ventured to set such a substitute, of such bigoted cruel principles, in that place. This Harvey condemned a poor labouring man of Calais, who said he would never believe that any priest could make the Lord's body at his pleasure. Whereupon he was accused before the commissary, who roundly condemned him to be burnt, inveighing against him, and saying he was an heretic, and should die a vile death. The poor man said he should die a viler shortly. And so it came to pass; for half a year after he [Harvey] was hanged, drawn, and quartered, for treason.[1]

He seemed to have succeeded in the room of a man of better principles, called Sir John Butler, who was deprived of his commissaryship by some bishops, commissioners from the king for the examining several persons suspect of religion in Calais. The council there had, about the year 1539, complained of him as a maintainer of Damplip, a learned and pious preacher there. So he was sent for into England, and charged to favour Damplip, because he preached so long there, and was not restrained, nor punished by him. He answered warily and prudently, that the Lord Lisle, lord deputy, and his council, entertained and friendly used him, and countenanced him by hearing him preach, so that he could not do otherwise than he did. After long attendance upon the king's commissioners, he was discharged, and returned home, but discharged also of his commissary's place too.[1]

---

[1] Fox, p. 1120 [vol. v. p. 523].

And having been an officer of the archbishop's, I will add a word or two more concerning him. About the year 1536, he was apprehended in Calais, and bound by sureties not to pass the gates of that town, upon the accusation two of soldiers, that he should have said, in contempt of the corporal presence, that "if the sacrament of the altar be flesh, blood, and bone, then there is good *aqua vitæ* at John Spicer's," where probably was very bad. This Butler, and one Smith, were soon after brought by pursuivants into England, and there brought before the privy council, in the Star Chamber, for sedition and heresy (which were charges ordinarily laid against the professors of the Gospel in those times), and thence sent to the Fleet; and brought soon after to Bath-place, there sitting Clark bishop of Bath, Sampson bishop of Chichester, and Reps bishop of Norwich, the king's commissioners.

And no wonder he met with these troubles, for he had raised up the hatred of the friars of Calais against him by being a discoverer and destroyer of one of their gross religious cheats. There had been great talk of a miracle in St. Nicholas' Church, for the conviction of men, that the wafer, after consecration, was indeed turned into the body, flesh, and bones of Christ. For in a tomb in that church, representing the sepulchre, there were lying upon a marble stone three hosts sprinkled with blood, and a bone representing some miracle. This miracle was in writing, with a Pope's bull of pardon annexed, to those, I suppose, that should visit that church. There was also a picture of the resurrection, bearing some relation to this miracle. This picture and story Damplip freely spake against in one of his sermons, saying, that "it was but an illusion of the French before Calais was English." Upon this sermon (the king also having ordered the taking away all superstitious shrines), there came a commission to the lord deputy of Calais, to this Sir John Butler, the archbishop's commissary, and one or two more, that they should search whether this were true; and if they found it not so, that immediately the shrine should be plucked down; and so it was; for, breaking up a stone in the corner of the tomb, instead of the three hosts, the blood and the bone, they found soldered in the cross of marble, lying under the sepulchre, three plain white counters, which they had painted like unto hosts, and a bone that is in the tip of a sheep's tail. This Damplip showed the next day, being Sunday, unto the people; and after that, they were sent to the king by the lord deputy. But this so angered the friars and their creatures, that it cost Damplip his life, and Commissary Butler much trouble, and the loss of his office.

---

[1] Fox [vol. v. p. 513].

After Harvey, Hugh Glazier, B.D. and canon of Christ's Church, Canterbury, succeeded in the office of commissary to the archbishop for Calais. He was once a friar, but afterwards favoured the reformation. He was put up to preach at Paul's Cross the first Lent after King Edward came to the crown; and then asserted the observation of Lent to be but of human institution.

This year the cathedral church of Canterbury was altered from monks to secular men of the clergy, viz. prebendaries, or canons, petty-canons, choristers, and scholars.[1] At this erection were present, Thomas Cranmer, archbishop; the Lord Rich, chancellor of the court of the augmentation of the revenues of the crown; Sir Christopher Hales, knight, the king's attorney; Sir Anthony Sentleger, knight; with divers other commissioners. And nominating and electing such convenient and fit persons, as should serve for the furniture of the said cathedral church, according to the new foundation, it came to pass, that when they should elect the children of the grammar-school, there were of the commissioners more than one or two who would have none admitted but sons, or younger brethren, of gentlemen.[2] As for other husbandmen's children, they were more meet, they said, for the plough, and to be artificers, than to occupy the place of the learned sort. So that they wished none else to be put to school, but only gentlemen's children. Whereunto the most reverend father, the archbishop, being of a contrary mind, said, "That he thought it not indifferent so to order the matter; for," said he, "poor men's children are many times endued with more singular gifts of nature, which are also the gifts of God, as with eloquence, memory, apt pronunciation, sobriety, and such like; and also commonly more apt to apply their study, than is the gentleman's son delicately educated." Hereunto it was on the other part replied, "That it was meet for the ploughman's son to go to plough, and the artificer's son to apply the trade of his parent's vocation; and the gentleman's children are meet to have the knowledge of government and rule in the commonwealth. For we have," said they, "as much need of ploughmen as any other state, and all sorts of men may not go to school." "I grant," replied the archbishop, "much of your meaning herein as needful in a commonwealth; but yet utterly to exclude the ploughman's son and the poor man's son from the benefit of learning, as though they were unworthy to have the gifts of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon them, as well as upon others, is as much to say, as that Almighty God should not be at liberty to bestow His great gifts of grace upon any person, nor nowhere else, but as we and other men shall appoint them to be employed, according to our fancy, and not according to His most godly will and pleasure, who giveth his gifts both of learning and other perfections in all sciences, unto all kinds and states of people indifferently. Even so doth he many times withdraw from them and their posterity again those beneficial gifts, if they be not thankful. If we should shut up into a strait corner the bountiful grace of the Holy Ghost, and thereupon attempt to build our fancies, we should make as perfect a work thereof as those that took upon them to build the tower of Babel; for God would so provide, that the offspring of our best-born children should peradventure become most unapt to learn, and very dolts, as I myself have seen no small number of them very dull, and without all manner of capacity. And to say the truth, I take it that none of us all here being gentlemen born (as I think), but had our beginning that way, from a low and base parentage: and through the benefit of learning, and other civil knowledge, for the most part all gentlemen ascend to their estate." Then it was again answered, "That the most part of the nobility came up by feats of arms, and martial acts." "As though," said the archbishop, that "the noble captain was always unfurnished of good learning and knowledge to persuade and dissuade his army rhetorically, who rather that way is brought unto authority, than else his manly looks. To conclude, the poor man's son, by pains-taking, will for the most part be learned, when the gentleman's son will not take the pains to get it. And we are taught by the Scriptures, that Almighty God raiseth up from the dunghill, and setteth him in high authority. And whensoever it pleaseth Him of His divine providence, He deposeth princes unto a right humble and poor estate. Wherefore, if the gentleman's son be apt to learning, let him be admitted; if not apt, let the poor man's child that is apt enter his room," with words to the like effect. Such a seasonable patron of poor men was the archbishop.

---

[1] [See Parker Society edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii pp. 396—399.]

[2] Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxix. 115].

Bishops consecrated.

April the 4th, Edmond Bonner, LL.D., bishop of Hereford, consecrated bishop of London, and Nicholas Hethe, consecrated bishop of Rochester, in a chapel in St. Paul's, on the north side of the nave, by Stephen [Gardiner] bishop of Winton, assisted by Richard [Sampson] bishop of Chichester, Robert [Warton] bishop of St. Asaph, and John [Skyp] bishop of Hereford, by virtue of commissional letters from the archbishop.[1]

December the 29th, Thomas Thirlby,[2] consecrated the first bishop of Westminster in St. Saviour's chapel, near the sepulchre of Henry VII. in the church of Westminster, by [Bonner] the bishop of London; assisted by Nicholas [Hethe] bishop of Rochester, and John, Suffragan of Bedford, by letters commissional from the archbishop.

Dr. Butts, the king's physician, first moved him to take Dr. Thirlby into his service; for that the said Thirlby was accounted a favourer of all such as favoured sincere religion. The archbishop soon became acquainted with him, and liked his learning and his qualities so well, that he became his good lord towards the king's majesty, and commended him to him, to be a man worthy to serve a prince, for such singular qualities as were in him. And indeed the king soon employed him in embassies in France and elsewhere: so that he grew in the king's favour by the means of the archbishop; who had a very extraordinary love for him, and thought nothing too much to give him, or to do for him. And we may conclude it was by his means that, after the dissolution of the bishopric of Westminster, he was preferred to Norwich, in the year 1550. He complied with King Edward's proceedings all his reign; and so he did with Queen Mary's during hers, being then translated to Ely: and was then made use of to be one of the bishops (Bonner being the other) that were sent to Oxon to degrade the archbishop, which he did with tears.[1] If this bishop "did not, to his uttermost endeavour, practise to save the archbishop's life, he not only did him much wrong, but also abused his singular benevolence with overmuch ingratitude."[2] I use the words of Morice, the archbishop's secretary, as though he suspected he did not.

---

[1] Abp. Cranm. Regist. [259.]

[2] [Afterwards bishop of Norwich and Ely.]

CHAPTER XXIII.

All Souls' College visited.

The following year, the college of All Souls, Oxon, underwent the archbishop's visitation, by virtue of a commission, May 12, to John Cocks, the archbishop's vicar-general in spirituals, John Rokesby, LL.D., of the Arches, Walter Wright, LL.D., public notary, and John Warner, M.D., warden of the college. This visitation was occasioned upon a complaint of the very ill and loose behaviour of the members of that house. The college grew scandalous for their factions, dissensions, and combinations one against another;

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol viii. p. 80.]

[2] In a letter to Day, the printer, An. 1565; [which letter is preserved in the Harl. MSS. ccccxvj. 183.]

for their compotations, ingurgitations, surfeitings, drunkenness, enormous and excessive comessations. They kept boys in the college, under pretence of poor scholars. They entered not into orders, and became not priests after they were masters of arts: nor observed their times of disputations. Their habit and apparel was gaudy. And other things there were among them contrary to the statutes of the college. This visitation was prorogued, and all the visitors were reduced to one, viz. Dr. Wright. And in conclusion, the archbishop gave them a set of injunctions, declarations, and interpretations of their statutes, to the number of four and twenty. One was for the better frequenting chapel, and singing the service. Another for the residence of the warden, not to be absent above sixty days in a year. The rest were, to observe, at the dean's command, the solemn times of disputation. That such bachelors of arts that were fellows, should take their degrees of masters of arts, when they are standing for it. That several of them, being masters of arts, should take priests' orders. That the master and the rest, fellows and scholars, should wear long gowns to their heels, plain shirts, and not gathered about the neck and arms, and adorned with silk; and the rest should wear decent garments. Concerning keeping boys, beside such as were servants; that if any of the fellows, scholars, or servants of the college, shall keep any poor scholars, boy, or youth, to lodge with him in his chamber, or within the college, to nourish him with the fragments of the college, after such a day, that he be then admonished by the warden or sub-warden, &c. and such boys to be expelled the college.

But it seems this visitation did not effect the good ends intended by it: for not long after another commission for the visitation of this college was given by the archbishop to John Barbar, LL. D., official of his court of Canterbury.

In the month of October there issued out the king's letters to our archbishop for taking away superstitious shrines.[1] Which I suppose the archbishop himself procured, having complained to the king how little effect former orders from his majesty had taken (and particularly in his own church), for the images and bones of supposed saints, with all the monuments of their pretended miracles, to be taken away and defaced: and how his injunctions were illuded, which commanded that there should be no offerings nor setting up candles to them in any church, and especially in the cathedral church of Canterbury; which once before had been scoured of these superstitions, when Thomas à Becket's tomb, and the riches thereof, were taken away. The king in this letter commanded him to cause due search to be made in his cathedral church for shrines, and coverings of shrines, &c. and to take them away, that there remain no memory thereof; and to command all the curates and incumbents of livings to do the like.

---

[1] [See Parker Society edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 378.]

The king's letters were as follow.[1]

"*By the King.*

"Most reverend father in God, right trusty, and right entirely well-beloved, we greet you well: Letting you wit, that whereas heretofore, upon the zeal and remembrance, which we had to our bounden duty towards Almighty God, perceiving sundry superstitions and abuses to be used and embraced by our people, whereby they grievously offended Him and His word; we did not only cause the images and bones of such as they resorted and offered unto, with the ornaments of the same; and all such writings and monuments of fained miracles, wherewith they were illuded, to be taken away in all places of our realm; but also by our injunctions commanded, that no offering, or setting of lights or candles should be suffered in any church, but only to the blessed sacrament of the altar; it is lately come to our knowledge that this our good intent and purpose notwithstanding, the shrines, coverings of shrines, and monuments of those things do yet remain in sundry places of our realm, much to the slander of our doings, and to the great displeasure of Almighty God, the same being means to allure our subjects to their former hypocrisies and superstition; and also that our injunctions be not kept, as appertaineth. For the due and speedy reformation whereof we have thought meet by these our letters expressly to will and command you, that, incontinently upon the receipt hereof, you shall not only cause due search to be made in your cathedral church for those things; and if any shrine, covering of shrine, table, monument of miracles, or other pilgrimage, do there continue, to cause it to be taken away, so as there remain no memory of it; but also that you shall take order with all the curates, and others, having charge within your diocese, to do the semblable. And to see that our injunctions be duly kept, as appertaineth, without failing, as we trust you, and as you will answer to the contrary. Given under our signet, at our town of Hull, the iv day of October, in the xxxiii year of our reign."

---

[1] Abp. Cranm. Regist. [18].

This was dated from Hull, for the king was now in his progress towards Scotland, to meet the Scots' king according to appointment; though he met him not.

Whereupon the archbishop, by his letter dated from Lambeth, October 15, to Richard Lyel, LL.D., dean of the deaneries of Shoreham, Croydon, Bocking, Risborourgh, Tarring, and Pagham, enjoined him to take care to execute the king's will; to cite before him, with all speed, all and singular the ministers of the collegiate churches; and rectors, vicars, and priests of the parish churches within the deaneries aforesaid; and then to declare to them the contents of the king's letters, and to command them to observe exactly the king's injunctions. The like letters he also sent to Edmond Cranmer, archdeacon of Canterbury. An answer to which the said Edmond wrote to the archbishop, dated October 29, signifying his doing according to the archbishop's commandment. The like were written to Hugh Glazier, the archbishop's commissary-general in the town of Calais, and the marches of the same. Who sent his answer to the archbishop November 24, from the town of Calais.

I am apt to think that these letters of the king were circularly, and sent with the same command to all the bishops to see executed in their several dioceses; though the effect of them was according as the bishops themselves stood affected.

This year an exchange was made by the archbishop of the manor of Bishopsbourne for Beakesbourne, with Sir John Gage, comptroller of the king's household. Beakesbourne, anciently called Livingsbourne, was healthfully and conveniently seated, lying an easy distance from Canterbury, whensoever the archbishops were minded to be retired. This place Archbishop Parker took a great delight in, and intended greatly to enlarge by buildings; but died before he began his purpose. Archbishop Cranmer made considerable buildings here, and probably would have done more, had he continued in his prelacy. In the year 1552, he finished the gate-house now standing; as appears from the north and south sides thereof, wherein are two stones set in the brick-work, with the letters of his name, T. C. and coat of arms, and motto, *Nosce teipsum, et Deum;* together with the date, 1552. This manor now returned to the church again, from whence it had been for some time severed; only the owners changed. For whereas, before the dissolution of the monasteries, it belonged to the priors of Christ Church, Canterbury, now it came to the archbishops. This manor was not given to Christ Church till after the year 1400. Thomas Goldstone, a prior of that church, and a great builder, built the manor-house for a mansion for the priors, and a chapel annexed, and a new hall adjoining to the dormitory, and divers other edifices there, as we learn from the History of the Priors of Canterbury, lately published.[1] To which we may add a record in that church, to direct us in the computation of the time: viz. anno Dom. 1508. "In vigiliis S. Marci Capella dedicatur in Manerio de Lyvyngsborn, procurante Thoma Goldston." At the dissolution this was alienated and given to Gage; and from him it came to Archbishop Cranmer and his successors. And the bargain was confirmed by act of Parliament, anno Henr. 34.[2]

The archbishop, as he had opportunity, preferred learned and pious men in his diocese in the benefices of his church; and such as freely preached against the Pope and his superstitions, against images, and the worship of them. The chief of these were Nicholas Ridley (afterwards bishop of London), whom he made vicar of Herne, and prebend of Canterbury; and John Scory (afterwards bishop of Chichester), whom he made one of the six preachers; Michael Drum, and Lancelot Ridley, worthy men, were two more of the six. These he preferred, and divers others about through his diocese, that set the abuses of Popery open before the people's eyes in their sermons. This so angered the men of the old religion, and particularly some of his own church in Canterbury, that they detected them to the archbishop, by articling against them for their doctrine. This they did this year, when the archbishop visited his church. And about two years after they did so again, as shall be taken notice of in due season.

---

[1] [Wharton's] Anglo. Sacra, vol. i. p. 148.

[2] Records of Chr. Ch. Cant.

About this time it was that Serles and Shether, two of the six preachers of Canterbury, were by the archbishop's censure, put to recantation for some unsound passages they had preached; which made them such enemies to the archbishop, and such contrivers of his ruin, by devising and drawing up a great number of articles against him, if they could have accomplished their design, as shall be seen hereafter under the year 1543. It was observed of Shether at this time, that after the pronouncing his recantation, or declaration, he added these words, "Good Christians, I take God to record, that I never preached anything to you in my life but the truth." And so in short gave himself the lie, and overthrew all the recantation he had made before.

The latter end of the year there was a Convocation, wherein one of the matters before them was concerning the procuring a true translation of the New Testament; which was indeed intended, not so much to do such a good work, as to hinder it. For having decried the present translation, on purpose to make it unlawful for any to use it, they pretended to set themselves about a new one. But it was merely to delay and put off the people from the common use of the Scripture: as appeared plainly enough, in that the bishops themselves undertook it. And so having it in their own hands, they might make what delays they pleased. For in the third session, a proposition was made for the translation, and an assignation to each bishop of his task: as Matthew to the archbishop of Canterbury, Mark to [Longland] the bishop of Lincoln, Luke to Winton [Gardiner], John to Ely [Goodrich]: and so of the rest. But the archbishop saw through all this: and therefore, in a sessions that followed after, told the house from the king, to whom I suppose he had discovered this intrigue, that the translation should be left to the learned of both universities. This was a surprise to the bishops, who all, except Ely [Goodrich], and St. David's [Barlow], protested against it, and began to undervalue the sufficiency of the universities, as much decayed of late; and that they were but young men: and that the greatest learning lay in the Convocation-men. But the archbishop roundly said, that "he would stick by his master's will and pleasure; and that the universities should examine the translation."[1]

Bishops consecrated.

May 29, being Sunday, William Knight was consecrated bishop of Bath and Wells by Nicolas [Hethe] bishop of Rochester, by virtue of the archbishop's letters to him, assisted by Richard, Suffragan of Dover, and John, Suffragan of Bedford, in the chapel of the said bishop of Bath's house, situate in the Minories without Aldgate.

September the 25th, John Wakeman, late abbot of Tewkesbury, was consecrated the first bishop of Glocester, by the archbishop, Edmond [Bonner] bishop of London, and Thomas [Thirlby] bishop of Westminster, assisting.

John Chambre, B.D., was consecrated first bishop of Peterburgh, October 23, in the cathedral church of Peterburgh, in the presbytery there, by John [Longland] bishop of Lincoln, Thomas [Goodrich] bishop of Ely, and William [Rugge, *alias* Repps] bishop of Norwich, by commission from the archbishop.[2]

February the 19th, Arthur Bulkeley was consecrated [bishop of Bangor] in the chapel of John Incent, LL. D. dean of St. Paul's, by John [Salcot] bishop of Sarum, by virtue of letters commissional from the archbishop, William [Barlow] bishop of St. David's, and John [Wakeman] bishop of Glocester, assisting.

Robert King, another abbot and titular bishop Reonen, suffragan to the bishop of Lincoln, was this year consecrated bishop of Oxford. The date, or his consecrators, I cannot assign, the act being omitted in the archbishop's register. He was first a monk of Rewley, a priory without Oxford, of the Cistertian order; then abbot of Bruerne in Oxfordshire; after, abbot of Thame, of which he was also called bishop; and lastly of Oseney: both which he surrendered to the king at the dissolution of monasteries. This man, when suffragan, preached at St. Mary's in Stamford, where he most fiercely inveighed against such as used the New Testament. In Queen Mary's reign he was a persecutor of the Protestants, and died, 1557.

---

[1] Fuller's Ch. Hist. from the records of Canterbury [vol. iii. pp. 197—8, 201].

[2] [Strype is in error here; the bishop of Ely was assisted by Robert Down and Thomas Filiden. See note in Eccl. History, Society's edition (from Cran. Reg. fol. 207, b.) Vol. j. p. 516.]

CHAPTER XXIV.

The King's Book revised.

THE archbishop was this year, among other things, employed in the king's book, as it now was called, that is, "The Erudition of any Christian Man," spoken of before.[1] For the king was minded now to have it well reviewed, and if there were any errors, and less proper expressions, to have them corrected and amended: and so to have it recommended unto the people as a complete book of Christian principles, in the stead of the Scripture; which, upon pretence of their abuse of, the king would not allow longer to be read. Accordingly a correction was made throughout the book; and the correct copy sent to Cranmer to peruse: which he did, and added his own annotations upon various passages in it at good length. And had it not been too long, I had transcribed it wholly out of a volume in the Benet College library. But for a taste take this that follows. In the title, under his own hand, was this written:—

Animadversions upon the king's book.[2]

Upon the Chapter of Original Sin.

For the first offence of our father Adam.—No man shall be damned for the offences of Adam, but for his own proper offences, either actual or original. Which original sin every man hath of his own, and is born in it, although it came from Adam.

---

[1] [See p. 76.]

[2] Miscellanea D. inter MSS. C.C.C.C. [No. civ. fol. 241].

The principal means (viz. God's favour) *whereby all sinners attain their justification.*—This sentence importeth, that the favour and love of the Father of heaven towards us is the means whereby we come to His favour and love. And so should one thing be the means to itself. And it is not the use of Scripture to call any other the means and mediator for us, but only Jesus Christ, by whom our access is to the Father.

Having assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy, willing to enter into his perfect faith.—He that hath assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy hath already entered into a perfect faith, and not only hath a will to enter into it; for perfect faith is nothing else but assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy.

Upon the Explication of the Tenth Commandment.

Without due recompense. — This addition agrees not well with the coveting of another man's wife, wherein is no recompensation. And in the other things, although recompensation be made, yet the commandment nevertheless is transgressed and broken.

Upon another Chapter concerning Obedience to the Civil Power.

By his ordinate power. — This word *ordinate power* obscureth the sentence in the understanding of them that be simple and unlearned; and among the learned it gendereth contention and disputation, rather than it anything edifieth. Therefore, methinketh it better, and more plain as it is in the print; or else to say, *by his ordinance;* for the Scripture speaketh simply and plainly, *potestati ejus quis resistit?*

By these few passages, which I have carefully taken out of the archbishop's own book, may be seen of what a critical and exact judgment he was.

But besides these *adversaria* in these papers of the archbishop's annotations, there be divers large discourses of his, upon several heads of religion, drawn up, as I conceive, upon the king's command, to be inserted into his book abovementioned. I have extracted some of these discourses, as upon faith, justification, and forgiveness of injuries; wherein may be seen his sound opinion in those great doctrines of Christian religion. I took also out of the same volume some specimen of three other discourses of his; one with this title, writ by his own hand, "De consolatione Christianorum contra metum mortis. Ex Doctoribus Ecclesiasticis." Compiled, I guess, as well for his own use, being not inapprehensive of his ticklish station and danger, from so many and implacable enemies which he had, as to be inserted in the aforesaid book. The others were two exhortations, to take the pains of sickness well, and adversity patiently; the one taken out of Cyprian, the other out of St. Augustin, lib. *De visitatione infirmorum.* The specimen of them are in the Appendix; as also the discourses of faith, justification, and forgiveness of injuries.[1]

This year Bonner bishop of London set forth injunctions for the clergy of his diocese, containing directions for their preaching and conversation, together with a catalogue of certain books prohibited, which the curates were to inquire after in their respective parishes, and to inform their ordinaries of them, and of those in whose possessions they found them. Among these books were the English Testament of Tindal, and divers other pieces of the said godly and learned man; some prefaces and marginal glosses of Thomas Matthews in his English Bible. A book of Friar Barnes. The Supplication of Beggars. The Practice of Prelates. The Revelation of Antichrist. The Church of John Rastal. The Disputation between the Father and the Son. The preface made in the English primers by Marshal. This Marshal was he, I suppose, whose Christian name was Cutbert, and was D.D. and archdeacon of Nottingham, and died about 1549.[2] At this book I will stop a little, being a book of eminency and remark in those times; and that hath such a strain of truth and serious piety in it, that it seems very probable that the archbishop had a considerable hand in it, and procured the publication of it, *cum privilegio Regali.* It was styled, "A Goodly Primer, or Book of Prayers," and called "The King's Primer." I speak of the second edition, which was about the year 1535. It began with an admonition to the reader, containing very sharp and severe reflections upon the Popish devotions, and praying to saints. And towards the conclusion, the writer professeth, "That this his admonition proceded neither of blynde zele, or affection, neyther of wyll or purpose to offend or displease any man, moch less than to displease any saint in heven; and in no wyse than our blessed Lady, but evin of very pure love to the honour of God, and helth of mennes souls."

---

[1] Nos. XXXI. XXXII.

[2] [See p. 114.]

Then followeth a pious exposition of the Ten Commandments, and the Creed. Then is a general confession of sin; which goes according to the Commandments, after this manner:—1. I have not set my whole belief, confidence, trust and hope in thee, &c. 2. I have divided thy worship and honour from thee, and given it to thy creatures, and to dead things, imagined of my own fond fantasy: I mean, in the misusing of images. 3. I have abused thy name, &c. 4. In the Sabbath-day I have not given myself to hearing, reading, and learning the Holy Scriptures, &c. Then comes an exposition upon the Lord's Prayer, and the salutation. Some short prayers. Some graces before and after meat; most of which are graces still retained in our English primers, after the catechism. And the method of the book is the same with our children's primer now in use. In this edition there was a litany added, with a preface before it, directly against praying to saints, and showing the difference of the case, between presenting our petitions to God, and presenting a petition to an earthly king; that though this latter cannot be done without the mediation of some servant of the king, yet the former may be done immediately to God, in the name of Christ. Besides, he said, there were many doubtful saints: that many saints canonized by the bishop of Rome, whether they were saints or no, he committed to the secret judgment of God. By this taste of the preface, you easily see, why Bishop Bonner placed it among the prohibited books, to be diligently searched for. The litany the author added, for the sake of many people, that thought there could be no right prayers without they were in the old form of processions, which were by way of litany, or supplication to angels and saints. And so he writ in this preface, that it was for the contentation of such weak minds, and somewhat to bear their infirmities, that he had, at this his second edition of the primer, caused the litany to be printed. In this litany all doubtful saints are left out, and he addresseth only to the holy angels St. Michael, St. Raphael, &c. to pray for us; and the blessed apostles, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Andrew, &c. The prayer for the king nameth King Henry VIII. and his gracious son Prince Edward. In the calendar Thomas à Becket's days are still retained in red letters: but I suppose that was done of course by the printer, using the old calendar. In the same book is a large and pious paraphrase on Psalm li.: a dialogue between the Father and the Son: Meditations on Christ's passion; and many other things.

By somewhat that happened this year, the archbishop proved very instrumental in promoting the reformation of corrupt religion in the neighbouring nation of Scotland, which this year had received a great overthrow by the English army; and great numbers of Scottish noblemen and gentlemen were taken prisoners, and brought up to London, and after disposed of in the houses of the English nobility and gentry, under an easy restraint. The earl of Cassillis was sent to Lambeth; where the good archbishop showed him all respect, in providing him with necessaries and conveniences, but especially in taking care of his soul.[1] He detected to him the great errors of Popery, and the reasons of those regulations that had been lately made in religion in England. And so successful was the archbishop herein, that the earl went home much enlightened in true religion; which that nation then had a great aversion to, for they highly misliked the courses King Henry took. Which prejudices the king understanding, endeavoured to take off, by sending Barlow, bishop of St. David's, to Scotland, with the book of "The Institution of a Christian Man;" which nevertheless made no great impression upon that people. But this that happened to the Scottish nobility, that were now taken prisoners, and especially this guest of the archbishop, becoming better inclined to religion by the knowledge they received while they remained here, had a happier effect, and brought on the Reformation that after happened in that kingdom.

---

[1] Hist. Reform. vol. i. p. 320 [vol. i. p. 640].

The Parliament being summoned in January, in order to the king's making war with France (whither he intended to go in person), the archbishop resolved to try this occasion to do some good service again for religion, which had of late received a great stop. His endeavour now was to moderate the severe acts about religion, and to get some liberty for the people's reading of the Scripture. Cranmer first made the motion, and four bishops, viz., Worcester [Bell], Hereford [Skyp], Chichester [Sampson], and Rochester [Hethe], seconded him.[1] But Winchester [Gardiner] opposed the archbishop's motion with all earnestness. And the faction combined with so much violence, that these bishops and all other fell off from the archbishop; and two of them endeavoured to persuade the archbishop to desist at present, and to stay for a better opportunity. But he refused, and followed his stroke with as much vigour as he could; and in fine, by his persuasion with the king and the lords, a bill passed. And the king was the rather inclined thereunto, because he, being now to go abroad upon a weighty expedition, thought convenient to leave his subjects at home as easy as might be. So with much struggling an act was passed, intituled, "An act for the advancement of true religion, and the abolishment of the contrary." In this act, as Tindal's translation of the Scriptures was forbidden to be kept or used, so other Bibles were allowed to some persons, excepting the annotations and preambles, which were to be cut or dashed out. And the king's former proclamations and injunctions, with the primers, and other books printed in English, for the instruction of the people before the year 1540, were still to be in force, which it seems before were not. And that every nobleman and gentleman might have the Bible read in their houses: and that noble ladies and gentlewomen, and merchants, might read it themselves: but no men or women under those degrees. That every person might read and teach in their houses the book set out in the year 1540 (which was, "The necessary Erudition of a Christian Man"), with the Psalter, Primer, Pater-noster, Ave, and Creed in English. But when Winchester [Gardiner] and his party saw that they could not hinder the bill from passing, they clogged it with provisos, that it came short of what the archbishop intended it: as, that the people of all sorts and conditions universally might not read the Scriptures, but only some few of the higher rank: and that no book should be printed about religion without the king's allowance: and that the act of the Six Articles should be in the same force it was before.

---

[1] Hist. Reform. vol. i. p. 321 [vol. i. p. 643].

A Bishop consecrated.

June the 25th, being Sunday, Paul Bush, provincial of the Bonhommes, was consecrated the first bishop of Bristol by Nicolas [Hethe] bishop of Rochester, assisted by Thomas [Thirlby] bishop of Westminster, and John, Suffragan of Bedford. This consecration was celebrated in the parish-church of Hampton, in the diocese of Westminster.

CHAPTER XXV.

Presentments at a Visitation.

By the act above mentioned, the generality of the people were restrained from reading the Holy Scriptures. But in lieu of it was set forth by the king and his clergy, in the year 1543, a doctrine for all his subjects to use and follow; which was the book above said: and all books that were contrary to it were by authority of Parliament condemned. It was printed in London by Thomas Barthelet. This book the archbishop enjoined to be made public in his diocese, (as I suppose it was in all other dioceses throughout the kingdom), and allowed no preaching or arguing against it. And when one Mr. Joseph, once a friar in Canterbury, now a learned and earnest preacher (and who was afterward preferred to Bow Church in London), had attempted to preach against some things in the book, the archbishop checked and forbad him: for indeed there were some points therein which the archbishop himself did not approve of, foisted into it by Winchester's [Gardiner] means and interest at that time with the king. Which bishop, politicly as well as flatteringly, called it "The King's Book," a title which the archbishop did not much like; for he knew well enough Winchester's hand was in it: and so he told him plainly in King Edward's time, when he might speak his mind; telling him in relation thereunto, that *he had seduced the king.* But because of the authority of the Parliament ratifying the book, and the many good and useful things that were in it, the archbishop introduced and countenanced it in his diocese, and would not allow open preaching against it.

The archbishop, about the month of September, held a visitation in Canterbury; chiefly because of the jangling of the preachers, and the divers doctrines vented among them, according as their fancies, interests, or judgments led them. The visitation proceeded upon the king's injunctions, and other late ordinances. And here I shall set down before the reader some of the presentments, as I take them from an original in a volume that belonged to this archbishop. Wherein notice may be taken, what ignorance was then in some of the priests; what bandying against one another, and what good progress the Gospel did begin to make, and what good numbers of priests and laymen there were that savoured of the Gospel-doctrine.[1]

Sir Humphrey Chirden, parson of St. Elphin's, on a Sunday in Lent, said, "If Judas had gone to God and confessed his fault, saying *Peccavi*, as he went unto the priests, he had not been damned." This passage was plain enough levelled against confessing to a priest. But this was presentable, because against the Six Articles.

One Lancaster, the parson of Pluckley, was presented, because that when one Giles said, that he blessed himself daily and nightly, saying "In nomine Patris, et Filii, Spiritûs Sancti;" and then said, in the honour of God and our Lady, and all the company of heaven, and for all Christian souls that God would have prayed for, a Pater-noster, an Ave, and a Creed; the said parson said to him, that if he knew it of truth that the said Giles used the same form of prayer, he would not accompany him, nor once drink with him.

Vincent Ingeam (a justice of peace I suppose) commanded on Easter Monday, 33° of the king,[2] that no man should read, or hear the Bible read, upon pain of imprisonment: and cast two into prison, the one for speaking against him therein, and the other for showing him the king's injunctions concerning the same. He repugned against the doings of the commissary for taking down the image of St. John, by the king's commandment. Where I find, among other witnesses to this, one Daniel Cranmer, a relation doubtless of the archbishop.

---

[1] Intit. Accusatio Cranmer, inter MSS. C.C.C.C. [No. 128, fol. 203].

[2] [This was in the year 1540.

Sir Thomas, curate of Shoulden, and Thomas Sawier, set up again four images, which by the king's commandment were taken down, for abuses by pilgrimages and offerings: viz., St. Nicolas, St. Stephen, St. Laurence, and our Lady.

Another accused for forsaking his own parish-church at the time of Easter, two years together [not liking his parish-priest for his affection to the Gospel], and for going to Walsingham [in pilgrimage]: and that he would at no time show to the vicar a lawful certificate that he had received the blessed sacrament at the time commonly accustomed, as a Christian man ought to do; and obstinately refused to learn his Pater-noster, Ave, Credo, and Ten Commandments in English, according to the king's injunctions.

Sir Edward Spooner, vicar of Boughton, had not declared to his parishioners the right use of ceremonies, neither showed the difference between them and works commanded by God, as he is commanded by the king's proclamation. He had not preached against the bishop of Rome's usurped power, and set forth the king's supremacy, as he is bound by the king's injunctions, and other his proceedings. He hath not preached his quarter's sermons, neither at Boughton, nor at his benefice in the Marsh. He never declared, that the even of such saints, whose days be abrogated, be no fasting-days.

The archdeacon of Canterbury (that was Edmund, the archbishop's brother), the morrow after the Ascension was three years, took out of the church of St. Andrew's in Canterbury three lamp tapers burning before the sacrament, and a coat from a rood, and did violently break the arms and legs of the rood.

Sir William Kemp, vicar of Northgate, had not read the Bible since Pentecost, as he was commanded by the ordinary. He doth not declare to his parishioners the right use of holy water, holy bread, bearing of candles upon Candlemas-day, giving of ashes, bearing of palms, creeping to the cross: for lack whereof the most part of the said parish be as ignorant in such things as ever they were. And many of them do abuse holy water, inasmuch that against tempests of thunder and lightning many run to the church for holy water to cast about their houses, to drive away evil spirits and devils, notwithstanding the king's proclamations in the same. He hath not read to them the king's injunctions, as he ought to do, by reason whereof his parish be blind and ignorant in them.

Bartholomew Joy confessed to his curate in general, saying, I am a sinner. And when the vicar asked him wherein he had sinned, he answered, that he had confessed himself to the Lord already, and that he would make none other confession at that time; and so departed.

John Tofts, Christopher Levenysh, Bartholomew Joy, in the thirtieth of the king, pulled down all the pictures in the church of Northgate in Canterbury, except only the rood, Mary and John, the twelve Apostles, the picture of our Lady, and St. John Baptist. And in the thirty-fourth of the king, Tofts pulled down the picture of our Lady, and had her and the tabernacle home to his house, and there did hew her all to pieces. And at another time, the same Tofts openly, with a loud voice, read the Bible in English in the church to his wife, Sterkies' wife, George Tofts' wife, to the midwife of the same parish, and to as many others as then were present.

Joanna Meriwether of St. Mildred's parish, for displeasure that she bare towards a young maid named Elizabeth Celsay, and her mother, made a fire upon the dung of the said Elizabeth; and took a holy candle, and dropped upon the said dung. And she told unto her neighbours, that the said enchantment would make the cule of the said maid to divide into two parts.

Rafe, the bell-ringer of Christ-Church, at the burial of Dr. Champion [the archbishop's chaplain], after the priest had censed his grave, and a boy was bearing away the censers and the coals, called after the boy, and took the censers, and poured the hot coals upon him in his grave, to the great slander of the said Dr. Champion, as though he had been an heretic, worthy burning. Also he said, the king was content that all images should be honoured as they were wont to be.

Coxson, petty canon of Christ Church, made his testament, by the advice of Mr. Parkhurst, Mr. Sandwich, and Mr. Mills, canons of the said church; and gave and bequeathed to every vicar of Christ Church twenty pence, that had a pair of beads, and would say our Lady's psalter for his soul departed. And this was executed according to the will.

The parson of Allington never preached in the church of Allington, nor declared against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, nor set forth the king's supremacy according to the king's proclamations, letters, and injunctions. He hath been a great setter forth in his parish of the Maid of Kent, pilgrimages, feigned relics, and other such superstitions; and yet never recanted, and reproved the same, according to the king's majesty's injunctions. He hath not declared to his parishioners, that the eves of such holy days as be abrogate be no fasting-days, according to the king's injunctions. So upon the Sundays, Candlemas-day, Ash-Wednesday, Palm-Sunday, and Good-Friday, he hath not declared the true use of the ceremonies, used those days according to the king's proclamation.

The curate of Stodmarsh did dissuade men from eating of white-meats the last Lent and rebuked them that did eat white-meats. About All-hallowtide was twelvemonth he preached in St. Dunstan's church beside Canterbury, that "men should love God, and fear God, but not to trust Him too much."

Turnor, in the time of his being at Chartham, did cast no holy water, neither before the sacrament, nor upon any altar in the church (except the high altar). Nor also before the crucifix in the rood-loft, according to the laudable ceremony. He christened three children upon one day, and did not anoint them with holy oil, neither upon back nor belly. He neither incensed the crucifix in the rood-loft, nor any altar in the church, except the high altar: nor distributed any holy candles among his parishioners, as hath been accustomed.

Sir James Newman and one Lawrence took down an image of our Lady; to the which was no offering, except candles at the purification of women: nor any miracles noted to be done there by the said image.

Scory, one of the six preachers, said, that much superstitions were used in the Church, as making of crosses upon Palm-Sunday, setting of them up, and blessing them with the holy candles; ringing of bells in the thunder. "For think you," said he, "that the devil will be afraid, or flee away at cross-making, hurling of holy water, ringing of bells, and such other ceremonies; when he was not afraid to take Christ Himself, and cast Him on His back, and set Him on a pinnacle? Those things that be good of themselves may not utterly be put away, although they be abused. For then the holy sacrament of the altar should be set aside, which is daily bought and sold."

Serles, one of the six preachers, in a sermon said, "If the preacher preach error and erroneous doctrine, the simple man, though he receive it and believe it, it doth not infect nor corrupt him." And this he repeated twice. He said also, that "Moses sent letters from hell, to teach the state thereof, and how men should live: and another likewise out of heaven. *Item*, they say," said he, "that only faith justifies, and that it maketh no matter how we do live: Christ died for us, and by His blood hath washed all our sins away; therefore what needeth us to fast or pray?"

Sandwich, a canon of Christ's Church, said in his sermon in the year 1542, "Whereas a good Christian, or evil, preached unto you truly the word of God, as I report me to the conscience of you all; yet some that have evil ears, did evil report of me. But if their ears were cut off, as Malchus' was, and set up where every man might wonder at them, I think therein a man should not wish much against charity." At another time, in the year 1543, he said in his sermon, "Some, if they are given to goodness, to follow the decrees of holy Church, to kneel before the blessed sacrament, they will counsel them from the same, and say, 'Deus in manufactis templis non habitat.' They will have none of the holy doctors. They will not have St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Hierome, St. Gregory, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, &c. Since the time we have been given to new fangles, the spirit of new fangle hath brought in the spirit of error. But what remedy then," said he, "to obtain the spirit of truth again? Of that," said he, "I spake the last time that I preached, and showed you that we must return where we went out. We must return to our dog, to our conscience again; and that will certify us where is the truth."

Shether, one of the six preachers said, "That there was one strait way to the truth, in which we and all men have gone a long time; saving a few now of late, not being content to follow that trade, have wandered in divers pathways to seek a nearer way to the truth. But they are like unto one, that, being clean lost, was fain to ask which way he might go to the end of his journey? And to such it was answered, You be clean out of the way, and there is none other means for you, but even to turn back again, and to begin your journey again where you left." Nothing at all, as the informer adds, admonishing the people of the way, which men had lost, by defending and retaining the usurpations of Rome: nor no mention that the king's majesty hath reformed the abuses of superstitious religion. But even as one, that would have all things honestly reformed, to revert again into their superstition, for the maintenance of all blindness and error, commanded every man to turn back, and to begin where they left.

Dr. Willoughby, the vicar of Chilham, keepeth still in his church a certain shrine gilt, named St. Austin's shrine: which shrine was conveyed from St. Austin's of Canterbury unto the parish-church of Chilham, at the suppression of the monastery of St. Austin's. *Item*, a rood there, which had shoes of silver, being a monument of pilgrimage, or offering, standeth yet still, being only spoiled of the monument. He said, images had power of God to help sick people, vowing unto them, the communication then being of our lady of Courtupstreet, between the said vicar and one Dawson of Chartham, a miller. *Memorandum*, that Potter's wife was banished out of Feversham for her suspect lying with Dr. Willoughby, and also was compelled to forsake Chilham for the same, about two or three years past; and yet she remains in the company of the said Doctor.

Serles, mentioned before, in a sermon made in the chapter-house of Christ's Church, anno 1543, said, Some that occupy this place of preaching say no matins, mass, nor even-song, once in a quarter. They be never seen confessed, nor to occupy porteous nor mass-book. These use no vocal prayer: beware of their doctrine. In the church of Lenham, in the day of Assumption, he said, That as the moon is in the full at fourteen days, even so Mary was conceived fully with Christ when she was fourteen years old. *Item*, he said, That if one had looked in Mary, when she was full conceived with Christ, he should have perceived Him in His mother's womb with a bush of thorns on his back: for He was crucified, crowned, and pricked with thorns. That Mary bare Christ poorly; for she had no fire, but begged a coal of one and a stick of another, to warm her child. He preached, that Mary nourished her son with milk, but not with material milk, but with milk that came from heaven: for no woman else can nourish her child with material milk, than she that is conceived by knowledge of man. [And no question this heavenly milk came along the milky way.] That all the whole faith of the world remained in Mary only for the space of three days and three nights. That faith was dead in the Apostles, and in all the world, from the death of Christ till His resurrection, and remained in the Virgin Mary whole and only. That the sorrows that she had were greater and more painful than Christ's, but for death only. That Christ descended into hell, and rose the third day and ascended into heaven, and many more with him; saying thus, "Multa corpora ascenderunt cum Christo, ut perhiberent testimonium." In Ashford he preached, that prayer was not acceptable with God, but in the church only, and nowhere else; alleging this text, "Domus mea domus orationis vocabitur." Then and there he said also, You fellows of the new trick, that go up and down with your Testaments in your hands, I pray you what profit take you by them? [This last passage relating to the Testament was interlined by Cranmer himself.] As Adam was expulsed out of Paradise for meddling with a tree of knowledge, even so be we for meddling with the Scripture of Christ. He said, There were some that said, that part of the Ave Maria was made to a strumpet. That Christ in the Gospel confounded Mary Magdalene with two parables, likening her to an ale-stake, and to a poor woman whom an emperor had married, and in his presence did lie with a leprous lazar-man. Anno 1542, preaching in Kennington Church on Good-Friday, he said, That as a man was creeping to the cross upon a Good-Friday, the image loosed itself off the cross, and met the man before he came to the cross, and kissed him. At the funeral of Mr. Boys he preached, "That by the receiving of the sacraments and penance, all a man's deadly sins were forgiven clearly, but the venial sins remained; and for them they that died should be punished, except they were relieved by masses and dirges after their death. [This that follows is Cranmer's hand;] He preacheth no sermon, but one part of it is an invective against the other preachers of Christ's Church.

Shether preached at Sandwich in the year 1542, That baptism taketh away but only original sin. At another time there, that every man, since the passion of Christ, hath as much liberty and free-will as ever Adam had in Paradise before his fall. That the new preachers, with the liberty of the Gospel, have caused our livings to be worse than the Turks. That Zacharias, and Elizabeth his wife, kept all the commandments of God; that it was a light thing for every man to keep them, if he would. That Christ and baptism did nothing else but wash away original sin: and that if any man after baptism did fall, he must purchase remission of his sins by penance, as Mary Magdalene did. That a certain king was sick of a leprosy, and had a vision to go to Jordan to be washed, and should be whole. And as he was in his good intent going, he thought that he had as good and sweet water in his own country as that was, and so returned back and washed himself therein, but nothing at all he thereby mended: and then he went to Jordan, and so was made whole. He compared man's conscience to a dog. Beware of these false preachers, which preach to you new fangles. Will you know how to discern a true preacher from a false? You have a dog, which is your conscience: whensoever you shall come to any sermon, ask your dog, what he saith unto it? If he say, it be good, then follow it: but if your dog bark against it, and say it is naught, then beware and follow it not. Adding these words, If you will ask your conscience, what she thinks of such new fangles as are brought into the Church of God, she will say that they be naught. He also preached, that men nowadays say, that holy water signifieth of Christ's blood. O! these are very glorious words. But it is not fit, good Christians, that such new fangles and fantasies of men should be brought into the Church of God. *Item*, In all his sermons he commonly useth to make invectives against the other preachers of this cathedral church; making the people believe that the preachers of the Church preach nothing but a carnal liberty, new fangles, new auricular confession, prayers, fasting, and all good works. This last is added by Cranmer's hand, as are also several other passages above, according as he himself took the examination.

And as the Gospellers thus articled against the Papists, so the Papists were as hot in drawing up articles against the Gospellers.

Scory, before mentioned, was accused, that he preached in a sermon at St. Elphin's, on Ascension-day 1541, That there was none in heaven but Christ only [meaning, I suppose, as mediators there with God, in opposition to the intercession of saints]. Then followeth, writ by Cranmer's hand, these words, "The witnesses against him were Bradkirk, priest; Shether, Marden, Colman;" adding, "These four be witnesses against all the articles of Ridley and Scory, in the first detection made to me two years past." Then follow more accusations of Scory. He preached in August last, in the chapter-house of Christ's Church, That no man may pray in any wise in Latin, or other tongue, except he understand what he prayeth: and that priests and clerks do offend, taking any money or reward for saying *Dirige* and mass. He said, that some preachers brought in their sermons *Gesta Romanorum*, persuading to the people, that it was the Gospel or the Bible. Another time, anno 1541, he preached in Lent in Christ's Church, Canterbury, That only faith justifies; and he that doth deny that only faith doth justify, would deny, if he durst be so bold, that Christ doth justify. He preached at Christ's Church another time, That the supper of the Lord, which is *Sacrificium et Hostia*, is not *Hostia pro peccatis*, but *Hostia laudis*. He preached at Feversham, anno 1542, in the Feast of Dedication, That the dedication of material churches was instituted for the bishops' profits; and that he could not see by Scripture that they might use any such fashions for that purpose, as for conjuration. And then they must conjure the devil out of the ground, or out of the lime and stones. And if so, then it were as necessary for every man's house to be consecrate or dedicate. Admit, quoth he, that the dedication of the same were lawful, yet the bishops should always preach (for that is their office); and other men might and may consecrate them as well as they.

Item, This sumptuous adorning of churches is against the old fashion of the primitive church. They had no such copes, nor chalices, nor other jewels, nor gildings, nor paintings of images, as we now have. And therefore, if I were curate, I would sell all such things, or lay them to pledge to help the poor.

At Christmas last there was a general procession by the king's majesty, and Mr. Scory preached these words: "Every country hath a custom to choose a patron. As England hath chosen St. George; Scotland, St. Andrew, &c.: thinking rather by intercession of saints to obtain the victory of their enemies. But, good people, quoth he, forasmuch as saints be circumscript, it is not possible for the saint that is in the north to hear the prayer that is made in the south; nor that saint that is in the south to hear the prayer that is made in the north." But this last passage of the Christmas sermon hath a cross struck through it.

Ridley, the prebendary, was charged, Sept. 22, 1543, that he preached at St. Stephen's, in the Rogation week, anno Reg. 32, that auricular confession was but a mere positive law, and ordained as a godly means for the sinner to come to the priest for counsel; but he could not find it in Scripture. And that there was no meeter term to be given to the ceremonies of the Church, than to call them *beggarly ceremonies*. That *Te Deum* hath been sung commonly in English at Herne, where the said Mr. Doctor is vicar.

Brooks, one of the six preachers, was accused for preaching, That all masters and mistresses were bound to eat eggs, butter, and cheese in Lent, to give example to their households to do the same. [This the papists thought a breaking of Lent, to allow this eating of white-meats, whereas fish only ought to be eaten.] And he thought that the ceremonies of the Church were but *beggarly ceremonies*, and that was the meetest term he could give them.

Thomas Carden, vicar of Lympne, in a Lenten sermon, anno 1543, said, He supposed St. Katharine was rather a devil in hell than a saint in heaven. And that the people said naught, and that this term was naught to say, That they should receive their maker at Easter; but they should say, we shall receive our housel. He preached, That the water in the font is no better than other water is.

Drum, one of the six preachers, in the year 1543, preached in a sermon made in Christ's Church, that we may not pray in an unknown tongue; for if we do, we do but mock with God, and of God we be mocked. As if a man do come to a lord, and babble to him words he knoweth not, the lord will but mock him, and account him for a fool. So thy prayer, man, not understood, is but babbling; and for that before God thou art but a fool. Your psalmody and song in the church is so taken with God, if that you, which do occupy yourselves therein, do not understand it. And thou that so babblest dost break the command of God: for it is written, "Non accipies nomen Dei in vanum." And you do call on God vainly, when you do call upon him in a tongue that you understand not. Wherefore to such as know not the Latin it must be needful to pray in the mother tongue. *Item*, That the material church is a thing made and ordained to content the affections of men, and is not the thing that pleaseth God, nor that God requires; but is a thing that God doth tolerate for the weakness of men. For as the father contenteth his child with an apple, or a hobby-horse; not because these things do delight the father, but because the child, ruled by affections, is more desirous of these things than the father is rejoiced in the deed: so Almighty God, condescending to the infirmities of man, and his weakness, doth tolerate material churches, gorgeously built, and richly decked; not because he requires, or is pleased with such things. This Drum was one of the Cambridge men that Cardinal Wolsey transplanted into his college at Oxon, and who suffered imprisonment there some time after with Cox and Frith, and divers others of the same college, for matters of religion.[1] But however, Drum afterwards fell away into Papistry.

Lancaster, parson of Pluckley, useth not in the churchporch any hally-water, according to the laudable custom of the Church. A great part of his parish useth not to receive hally-bread. Going on procession, he useth not to rehearse *Sancta Maria*, nor any other saints' names.

---

[1] [See p. 4.]

The curate of Much Mongeham, going on procession, refuseth, and will in no wise sing nor say the Litany in such manner as all other curates do.

All these collections I have made out of the original of this visitation of the archbishop. Wherein may be seen the particular matters in these times vented and tossed about in the pulpits; the trifling way of Popish preaching, consisting in ridiculous lying fables and stories, as is used still in Popish countries; and with how much more solidity, truth, and reason, the sermons of those who favoured the Gospel were replenished. We may observe here also, how diligent our archbishop was in his care of his diocese, and the pains he took to come to a perfect detection of his clergy, in order to their regulation, and divers other things, which an ingenious reader will take notice of.

The archbishop had all the prebendaries and preachers before him in his consistory at Croydon on Trinity Sunday was twelvemonth; where he argued with them, instructed, rebuked, exhorted them, according as he saw needful for every man, with relation unto the articles above said. He told Serles, who had preached in favour of images in churches, as representatives of saints, and not idols, "That *Imago* and *Idolum* was one thing; but the one was the Latin, the other the Greek." To which Gardiner, a prebend of the Church, replied, "that he did not think that an image and an idol was one, but that an image, not abused with honour, is an image, and not an idol." This saying of the archbishop did so gall them, that they took occasion after, in their sermons, to confute it. And they lyingly reported in Canterbury, that the archbishop should say, he would be even with Gardiner, or that Gardiner should repent his reasoning with him. Whereas all that Cranmer said was, that the communication that Gardiner had that day should be repeated again at his grace's coming to Canterbury. The same day the archbishop told them, that he had set in their church six preachers, three of the old learning, and three of the new. Now Gardiner told him, he thought that would not be for the most quietness in preachers. The archbishop replied, that he had showed the king's grace what he had done in that matter, and that the king's pleasure was, that it should be so. He then also gave them warning, that none should inveigh against others in their sermons.

CHAPTER XXVI.

A black Cloud over the Archbishop.

SOON after this, a great and black cloud hung over our archbishop's head, that threatened to break upon him in thunder and lightning. The prebendaries and others of the church of Canterbury, for the most part, were addicted to the Pope and the old superstitions; which the archbishop's endeavour to abolish, and to bring in truer knowledge of religion among them, caused them to do what they could to oppose him. And indeed they usually carried themselves disobligingly enough to him; which made him say to one of them, viz. Gardiner, alias Sandwich, "You and your company hold me short; but I will hold you as short." They seemed now to have a fair advantage against him, upon account of the statute of the Six Articles; which the king at this time stood much upon the execution of; and did give out, that he required justices and others, his officers, in their several places, to give notice of all disobedience against it. The bishop of Winchester also was now in great favour with the king, a constant adversary to Canterbury, and implacably set against the new learning, as it was then called. He thought to take this opportunity to deal so effectually with the king, as to get the Gospel destroyed, and all that adhered to it. And moreover, about this time was given out a saying ordinarily, that "the bishop of Winchester had bent his bow to shoot at some of the head deer:" meaning, as the issue made manifest, the archbishop of Canterbury and Queen Katharine Par, and others of the court.[1]

And to carry on his purpose, he, being a privy-counsellor himself, had an understanding with some of the council, who were of his mind, and ready to second these his ends; as among the rest was Baker, the chancellor of the Court of Augmentations. These were his confidents at home. Abroad, to be his solicitor and his great agitator, he had a very fit man for his purpose, one Dr. London, warden of New College, Oxon, prebend of Shipton in the church of Sarum, canon of Windsor, and dean of Oseney, a very busy zealot; who was in his time the great contriver and practiser of mischief against good men that could not comply with Papal superstitions. He was one of the three that some years before now prosecuted most rigorously the good students in the cardinal's college, when by imprisonment and hard usage several of them died. But this man was met with; not long after this suffering public shame for perjury, and died in a jail. At one and the same time Winchester, with this his trusty partner London, was driving on two games together; the one was to bring into trouble several of the king's own court, that were favourers of the Gospel, not liking that such should be so near the king; and the other was to overthrow the good archbishop, and his friends in his diocese of Canterbury, and to extinguish that light of the Gospel that began notably to shine there.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 486.]

For the compassing the first, they procured among them a special sessions to be held at Windsor; wherein they not only, upon the Six Articles, condemned four poor honest men, viz. Persons, Filmer, Testwood, and Marbeck, whereof the three former were burnt to death; but they drew up a bundle of indictments against a very great many, and some of eminency about the king, as Cardin and Hobby, knights of the king's privy chamber, with the ladies Harman and Weldon, Snowbal and his wife, and a great many more of the king's true and peaceable subjects. One Ockham, that served for clerk of the peace at that time, had these indictment ready to carry them to the chief patron of these plots [Gardiner], the bishop of Winchester. But this design, notwithstanding the privacy and crafty contrivance of it, took not effect; but he rather brought himself into disgrace thereby. For one Fulk, belonging unto the queen, being at sessions at Windsor at that time, and observing what was done, hastily rode to court, and discovered to the persons concerned what was hatching against them, letting them know that Ockham was coming with his indictments to the bishop of Winchester; who, as soon as he had received them, would without doubt have laid them before the king and his council. But by this seasonable notice they waylaid Ockham, and Cardin and others seized him, and all his papers, as soon as he came to court, before he got to Winchester. These papers were perused by some of the privy council; and seeing what large numbers, it may be, of themselves and of their friends, as well as others, were indicted, and designed for death, they thought fit to acquaint the king with it. And he, not liking such bloody doings, gave them all a pardon; and observing how Winchester was the great agent in all this, never liked him after.[1]

But Winchester and London had other irons in the fire against the archbishop and his friends at and about Canterbury; and particularly Dr. Ridley, a prebendary, Scory, Lancelot Ridley, and Drum, three of the preachers. And to bring mischief upon these, by the instigation of Winchester and practice of London, several of the prebendaries, and some of the six preachers, combine in a resolution to draw up accusations, both against the archbishop and against his friends. But neither did this Winchester's second plot succeed, but rather drew shame upon himself, and those that assisted in it.

There is a volume in the Benet College library, entitled, "Accusatio Cranmeri;"[2] wherein are contained the rough papers of the examinations that were taken of these accusers of the archbishop; the interrogatories put to them, their confessions and submissions to the archbishop. Upon which papers this was writ by the hand of Archbishop Parker, in whose possession they afterwards came, viz.:—

"*Memorandum*, that King Henry, being divers times by Bishop Gardiner informed against Bishop Cranmer, and the said Gardiner having his instructions of one Dr. London, a stout and filthy prebendary of Windsor, who there convicted [of perjury] did wear a paper openly, and rode through the town with his face toward the horse-tail; and also had information of Mr. Moyles, Mr. Baker, and of some others promoted by the said Cranmer (whose tales he uttered to the king); perceiving the malice, trusted the said Cranmer with the examination of these matters; which he did of divers persons, as by this doth appear."

---

[1] [Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 464, &c.]

[2] [No. 128. fol. 203.]

Hence I have carefully extracted some particulars, that I may give a particular account of this exquisite piece of malice; which aimed at nothing less than this good man's life, and that they might make him tread the same path with his friend Crumwel, two or three years before, as a reward of his endeavours in setting forward a reformation in the Church.

But first I will set down the names of the prebendaries and preachers of the cathedral church of Canterbury, because we shall have occasion often to mention divers of them.

Canons of Canterbury, anno 1543.

Richard Thornden, suffragan of Dover; Arthur Sentleger; Richard Parkhurst, parson of Lenham; Nicolas Ridley, John Meines, Hugh Glazier, William Hunt, William Gardiner, John Milles, John Daniel, Robert Goldson, John Baptist.

The six Preachers.

Robert Serles, vicar of Charing, Michael Drum, Lancelot Ridley, John Scory, Edmund Shether, Thomas Brooke.

Many of these he had himself preferred, and was a special good lord unto. And yet such was the ingratitude of several of them, that they voluntarily yielded to be made tools to carry on this wicked machination against him. The names of the chief actors were Thornden, who lived in the archbishop's family, and eat at his table, and with whom he used to converse most familiarly: Gardiner, whom Cranmer had taken as his own child; and he had resigned up himself to him with heart, body, and service, as he once solemnly professed to the archbishop: Sentleger, Milles, Parkhurst, Serles, and Shether; and one Dr. Willoughby, beneficed in Kent, and the king's chaplain.

The first attempt which they they made was, to prefer bills of accusation against the archbishop's chaplains and preachers, *viz.* the two Ridleys, Scory, Turner, Bland, Drum, Lancaster, and others; and slantingly through their sides striking at the archbishop himself. This they did to the justices at their sessions, upon the statute of the Six Articles. And that by the suggestion of London, who thought it convenient that the articles should first be carried to the sessions, and from thence returned to the council board. Willoughby, being the king's chaplain, and a man of some quality, was prevailed with to present the articles to the justices, and to make them willing to meddle in this affair, which otherwise they had no great stomach to do, fearing they might draw the king's displeasure upon themselves. Willoughby, by the direction of London, told Moyle and Thwaits, and the other their fellow-justices, that they should be shent for suffering such preaching and contention, without doing anything therein to stop it. And this was that they drove at; that after these articles were preferred from the justices up to court, and seen and read by the king and council, a commission should then be obtained: and such put into the commission as might effectually take order with the preachers. And these three prebendaries, Parkhurst, Gardiner, and Mills, they laboured especially to be put in commissioners; and that the archbishop himself should be left out, for so London had promised.

Their next care was to prepare the articles. Gardiner and Serles are extraordinary diligent in this work, and had been gathering matter a good space before. The writings were finished at Justice Moyle's house: and Willoughby seems to be the man that offered the bill in court. They dealt earnestly with Baro, clerk of the peace, to draw up the indictment against the good men complained of in their bill of articles (the chief whereof were John Bland, and Richard Turner), but he denied it. And when the jury, that were to be sworn, came, they took them not orderly as they stood in the panel, but overleaped some of them, and left them unsworn, that they might be sure to have such men as would do their business. After they had proceeded thus far, their next care was to get their articles sent up to the court, and laid before the king and council.

And to these aforesaid articles they drew up another book against the archbishop himself, the matter being first plotted between Dr. London and Serles, a discontented man, lately imprisoned. And this created them a new diligence, and divers journeys from Kent to London, to take their instructions, and from London to Kent, to get their informations. And there was at last a parcel of articles (trifles for the most part), raked out of the dunghill, picked up any where, and from any person, without proof: for they had nothing to show for the truth of them, but hearsay and report, and scarcely that. Serles inveigles Dr. Willoughby into this business, and brings him into acquaintance with Dr. London, in whose house the articles are first read, to whom it was propounded to present them. But when Serles had said, that the things mentioned in the articles were such as were openly spoken, Willoughby replied, "Though he heard such things, he was not sure they were true; and there was no record to affirm them true, no witnesses' hands being subscribed;" and so made a great boggle at presenting them, and put Serles upon that work. But London urged Willoughby to carry them to the council, telling him, that it would be a matter of great danger for him, being so near the king, if he should not give information of such ill things in that country where he lived; especially knowing the king's pleasure that such matters should not be concealed, but that complaint should be made of them to him and his council. And he bad him not fear; for that he himself had made such a spectacle[1] at Windsor in bringing to light abominable heresies (meaning in causing those three poor men to be burnt, and indicting so many more their maintainers), whereat the king he said was astonished, and angry both with the doers and bearers. And therefore if he should now shrink, he should show himself to be no true subject. Upon these words, which created some fear in Willoughby, if he should decline what London put him on to do, he was content to present them.

Thus having gotten a person ready for this part of the drudgery, to prefer the complaints against the archbishop, London writ them over again, and added other new articles as he pleased. Which Serles himself liked not: but London said he meant, by putting in some things, to bring the matter before the justices, and certain of the spirituality, for his purpose. Matters, many of them, of mere untruth, and not so much as the pretence of a rumour for. But he told Willoughby and Serles, that it should never be known to be their doings. And so Willoughby took the old copy with him into Kent, to get it recorded, and signed with hands: and London sent a copy to the bishop of Winchester. Willoughby being now at Canterbury about this business, requiring the prebendaries to sign the articles, they all refused. Up rode Willoughby to London again, and acquaints Dr. London therewith with a heavy heart. Then he began another practice, to tamper with the justices, bidding Willoughby let them know that the king would be angry with them for taking no more notice of the disorders in Kent. London went also himself to Moyle's lodging, a leading justice then in Kent, and talked with him, exhorting him to forward this work against the archbishop; telling him, that he himself had taken up my Lord of Canterbury before the council: meaning thereby to signify to him, that he needed not to fear him so much as he seemed to do, or his interest at the court. Upon this Moyle sent to several other gentlemen and justices to search out for any priests that wanted a crown [as a reward for their information], who should inquire about the country for what things were rumoured against the archbishop: and so as many rumours and bruits as were brought, were presently turned into articles. But Moyle warily sent all the reports that came to his hand to the archbishop, not so much out of goodwill to him, as that he might pretend to discharge his duty in giving information to the diocesan of abuses in his diocese: thereby also reckoning to avert the displeasure of the archbishop from himself. But this London liked not of, and told him he would mar all.

---

[1] Little thinking what a spectacle he was soon after to make there, when he was carried on horseback through the town, with a paper upon his head declaring his perjury, and his face to the horse's tail.

At length Serles and Willoughby had got together a mass of accusations; whether true or false mattered not, but a great heap they made. For these two were the chief collectors of articles, both at Canterbury and other places in Kent, London having advised them to get as much matter as could be devised; for it would be the goodliest deed, as he said, and the most bounden act to the king, that ever they did. These reports were digested into two or three books. Serles brought up some of the articles roughly drawn to London; and London transcribed them, and brought them to the bishop of Winchester, and there they were copied out by German Gardiner, his secretary, another busy man.

Gardiner, the prebendary, by this time had gotten a book of articles, signed by the rest of the prebendaries, and Willoughby brought them up: some of the prebendaries coming up too, being about to be the presenters of the book themselves. Winchester [Gardiner] and Baker, chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, gave the said prebendaries encouragement to proceed in what they went about. And busy London, to make the articles the better entertained, when they should be presented to the council, had officiously shown the copy of them to several of the said council beforehand.

I must here give this further note concerning Serles: that he was so zealous a man, that he had the year before put up to the council articles against the preachers of the Gospel: but they were such that the council thought not fit the king should see them. Which he complained of; and it seems at his return was clapt up in prison for his pains, for some either malicious insinuations or irregular practices herein.

Shether was another of the gang, and one of the forwardest in this invidious business against the innocent archbishop. He was one of those that came up to London to present the bill. It may be guessed what a hot-headed man he was, by a passage we meet with concerning him when he was proctor at Oxford in the year 1535. In which year he made such a combustion betwixt the university and the townsmen, that they being enraged against him, he went in danger of his life. So that he and his company were fain to go armed when they went abroad.[1] And when he was out of his proctorship, the university allowed him to defend himself from the townsmen at the university charge, if he should be set upon by them. This Shether brought up also his collections to one Ford, his brother-in-law, to write them out, which amounted to a great book of two days' labour,

---

[1] Wood's Fasti Oxon. p. 686 [vol. ii. 99.]

For they were resolved to have enough, and to make out in bulk what was wanting in truth.

Take an hint or two here of Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, the secret machine in all this ungrateful work. Coming once from the council, that then was beyond the sea at Calais, about the time of the breach with France, he, after hearing mass at the cathedral church at Canterbury, took his namesake Gardiner, the prebendary, by the hand, and asked him how he did, and how they did in Canterbury? meaning in relation to religion professed in the city. And when Gardiner answered, "But meetly;" he inquired, How they did within the house among themselves, with relation to the churchmen belonging to it? He told him, that they did not agree all in preaching. "So do I hear," said Winchester. Then he asked, wherein they did not agree? Gardiner then repeated somewhat of Ridley's and Scory's sermons, and this among other things, "That prayer ought to be made in a tongue known, and not in a tongue unknown; for so it were but babbling." Winchester then said, "he missed: for the Germans themselves are now against that saying. Well," said he, "this is not well. My Lord of Canterbury will look after this, I doubt not, or else such preaching will grow unto an evil inconvenience. I know well he will see remedy for it. Well, how do you do with them?" Gardiner replied, "My lord, hardly; I am much marked in my sermons: and I cannot tell whether I be taken, or no. I pray your good lordship of your counsel, what were best for me to do. I had rather leave preaching betimes, than to be taken in my sermons." Then said Winchester, "Do thus: write your sermon into a book, every word, as you will preach it; and when you go into the pulpit, deliver your book unto the chiefest man there that can read, and let him take heed of your book while you do preach, and say no more but that you have written and studied for; and I warrant you you shall do well enough. And when you do hear any man preach any otherwise than well, hold you contented, and meddle not; so shall you do best." Then he passed forth his time in communication concerning the ordinances of their choir, their statutes, their masses, and hours of them. And at the last sent for Ridley, the prebendary, and had some conference with him: but what, it is uncertain.

The bulky articles being at last hammered out and made ready, London now required Willoughby to deliver them to the council, which he would fain have shrunk from. He then charged him upon his allegiance to go with him to the council-chamber door, meaning to have him into the council. Having gotten him there, he went in, and informed some of the privy council (and friends, I suppose, to the matter), that Dr. Willoughby was without, desiring he might be called in. Willoughby was before instructed by London to use words to the council to this tenor, when he should deliver his articles, viz., "That the king and they had been at great charges, and taken great pains to set a good and godly way among them [meaning the statute of the Six Articles]; and for all that they had with them in Kent the most enormous heresies. And because he heard, that it was the king's will and pleasure that every man, on pain of his allegiance, should bring in what he knew, or else, if he knew and did conceal it, it should be his damage; therefore, in discharge of his duty, he came to tender that bill of articles." But this speech was not delivered that day, the council not being at leisure. And lest some people, knowing the pragmatical temper of London, might be jealous what he did at the court, and suspect it was for no good to the professors of the Gospel, it was studiously given out, that he was there for some promotion from the king.

The next day the sedulous man carried Willoughby to the Lord Privy Seal [Lord Russel, if I mistake not], with his articles; but neither would my Lord Privy Seal see them, having no leisure, as he pretended; I suppose, because he liked them not, and loved my Lord of Canterbury. The day after, London carried him to the bishop of Winchester, into whom he went and tarried an hour, carrying in the copy of the articles; in which time, no question, the bishop and his trusty substitute contrived for the managing of the matter. Soon after Willoughby being with Winchester, and desiring him that he might not be put to present the articles, not being able to testify to the truth of them, Winchester bade him "fear not to do his duty; and that if the matter were not to be abiden by, the doers should bear the blame, and not the presenter. And that it was all our duties to stand in such things as were contrary to the king's injunctions." But notwithstanding Willoughby got himself excused, and delivered them not; but the prebendaries soon after Easter did.

The articles are not specified in the papers I use; but, by the interrogatories and other passages, it appears that some of them were these that follow:—"That he rebuked Serles for that he preached, that images might be permitted in the Church as representatives of saints, and not be idols. Item, that the archbishop spake openly before all the prebendaries and preachers in consistory, that the king's pleasure was to have the six preachers consist of three of the new learning and three of the old. Item, that Serles and Shether underwent censure laid upon them by the archbishop for somewhat they had preached, when the honesty of their audience offered themselves to testify that they were falsely accused, and that that which was laid against them was not true, and although they were a great number, yet they could not be admitted. That they were innocent preachers, and, being innocent, were condemned, the one to prison and the other to read a declaration of false surmised articles. Item, that those that would speak against evil opinions, dared not; for if they did, they were complained of, and called seditious persons, stirring the people to commotion; and complaining to their ordinary, they got nothing but displeasure; and the evil preachers had much more favour and boldness. Item, that there were two images of Christ, and two of our Lady, that were taken down; whereunto was neither oblation, nor any lights standing before them."

Other articles, which were of Serles his own collecting, as appears by the interrogatories that Cranmer under his own hand had prepared to put to him, were such as these, and were chiefly against the archbishop's commissary. "That there were a great number of evil preachers in Canterbury diocese. That the archbishop's commissary [Dr. Leigh], in his visitation commanded that the wax-candles, blessed upon Candlemas-day, should not be delivered unto the people. That holy-water should not be borne, nor cast into men's houses. That in some churches, by the commissary's command, all the images were pulled down, and hewed with axes. That the commissary was most conversant with abjured persons, and other suspect of heresy, aiding, maintaining, and succouring them. That Joanna Bochier was delivered by the favour of the commissary. [Whereas indeed she was by the king's pardon. This is she that was afterwards burnt for Arianism in King Edward's days.] That one Giles came to Canterbury, in a courtier's coat and a beard, being a priest, and there lodged ten days. And one Hardes, a justice, complained of him to the commissary, but the commissary did nothing. [Whereas in truth he was not a priest, but a layman.] That a tailor in Canterbury did openly read and expound the Scripture in his own house; and open resort thither was suffered by the commissary. That the master of St. John's in Canterbury at his death refused to receive, and despised the blessed sacrament, and yet, by the sufferance of the commissary, was both buried like a true Christian, and also was of very many praised for a good and holy man. That Mr. Bland, in communication with Mr. Sponer, vicar of Boughton, denied auricular confession to be requisite, and delivered his opinion to the said Sponer in writing; which the commissary hearing, desired Sponer to let him see the writing, swearing that he would not keep it from him; but when he had the bill, he put it into his purse. That the commissary resigned a benefice to the said Bland, binding Bland and his successor, by a writing made under the hand of my lord of Canterbury and the chapter, to pay unto him and his assigns a great part of the clear yearly value for many years." This was the sum of Serles' articles; but most of them were found to be frivolous and false.

Articles yet more against our archbishop were, "That he held a constant correspondence with Germany, sending letters thither, and receiving letters thence." That he gave out a great many exhibitions in Germany, and had many pensioners there. (In relation to which, there seemed to be a design carrying on, that the bishop of Winchester should seize some of these letters of the archbishop; for Gardiner told him whose hands they passed through, namely, one Fuller of Canterbury, and that if the said bishop would send for him, and command him upon his allegiance, he should know more; or at least, that he might make use of Fuller for a witness to serve to prove this article.) Moreover, they put in their articles, "That his grace's sister was a milner's wife, and that she and her husband lived nine or ten years together in Canterbury. And then that she married to one Mr. Bingham, her former husband being yet alive, and that Mr. Commissary married her daughter. And though he were thus a married priest, yet he was joined with Mr. Dean [Wotton] to be one of the proctors of the clergy in the Convocation-house, and not of their election, but that it was obtained by the interest of his affinity."

The chief witnesses and persons concerned as vouchers and informers were, Roper, Balthazar, a surgeon, Heywood, Moor, Beckinsal, German Gardiner.

At length, after much ado, some of the prebendaries, in the name of the Church of Canterbury, delivered into the council, not long after Easter, the articles swelled to a good quantity of paper. And so they came at last into the king's hand. Having received them, he bade Baker, the chancellor of the Court of Augmentation, a Kentish man, being one of the privy council, and a privado in this matter, to send to Canterbury for some to prove the articles. The said chancellor orders the dean, ignorant of the matter, to send to Shether and Serles to come up as secretly as might be to London. Being come up, Shether repairs to the dean, who bad him, with Gardiner and Parkhurst, to go to the chancellor, who sent for them. Being come before him, he said to them, "That the king had a book against the archbishop delivered to him; which he had himself perused. And because that he perceived that they could say somewhat, wishing also for Serles (who was not yet come), he told them the king willed them to say what they knew, fearing no person, but to dread only one God and one king." Whereupon they took the book, and drew out such articles as they could witness of. He bad them return to Canterbury, and provide the witnesses there; and that Shether the youngest should come back again, after he had perfected the book in the day and year, and to bring it with him. From him they applied again to the bishop of Winchester, the great wheel, and shewed him what Baker had said to them.

CHAPTER XXVII.

The King the Archbishop's friend in this danger.

The king, well perceiving the malice of the men, and a plot contrived against an honest and innocent man, strengthened with the favour and aid of Winchester, and several of the counsellors, and the imminent danger the archbishop was in, except he himself did interpose, it pleased God to turn the king's heart to him. So he put the book of articles in his sleeve; and passing one evening in his barge by Lambeth-bridge, the archbishop standing at the stairs to do his duty to his majesty, he called him into the barge to him; and, accosting him with these words, "O my chaplain, now I know who is the greatest heretic in Kent," communicated to him these matters, showing him the book of articles against him and his chaplains, and bad him peruse it. This both surprised and troubled the archbishop not a little, that those of his own church, and justices of the peace, whom he had obliged, should deal so treacherously with him. He kneeled down to the king, and, well knowing how false the articles were, desired him to grant a commission to whomsoever it pleased him, to try the truth of these accusations, so as from the highest to the lowest they might be well punished, if they had done otherwise than became them. The king told him, "He would grant a commission, and that such affiance and confidence he had in his fidelity, that he should be the chief commissioner himself, to whom he would wholly commit the examination, with two or three more such as he should choose." When the archbishop replied, that it would not seem indifferent to make him a commissioner, who was a party accused; the king told him, "That he was sure he would not halt with him, although he were driven to accuse himself; but would speak the truth of himself if he had offended." The king added, that he knew partly how the matter came about [namely, by Winchester's subtle means], and that if he handled the matter wisely, he should find a pretty conspiracy against him. The king named but one, viz. Dr. Belhouse, to be in the commission; and the archbishop named Dr. John Cocks, his vicar-general, and Anthony Hussey, his register. The commission was made out of hand, and he was commanded to go himself into Kent upon it: and the king commanded the commissioners particularly, that it should be sifted out who was the first occasion of this accusation. Presently every one that had meddled in this detection shrunk away, and gave over their hold.

The archbishop came to Feversham himself, and there, as it seems, sat upon the commission, and drew up some interrogatories with his own hand for some of these informers; and having summoned these accusers before him, argued and expostulated meekly, and sometimes earnestly, with them; chiefly insisting upon their ingratitude and disingenuity with him. He asked Sentleger if he were at home on Palm-Sunday? (that was the day when the prebendaries signed the articles.) Sentleger saying, he was then at his benefice, the archbishop declared the *procession done that day*, as he called it; and said, whether he and the rest were present that day, they were all knit in a bond among them, which he would break: adding, in a passionate way of expression, "O Mr. Sentleger, I had in you and Mr. Parkhurst a good judgment, and especially in you; but ye will not leave your old mumpsimus." To which Sentleger boldly replied, that he trusted they used no mumpsimuses but those that were consonant to the laws of God and the prince. And with Shether, one of the busiest enemies the archbishop had in this affair, the archbishop so fatherly discoursed and argued, that Shether could not forbear weeping. He and Serles, two of the chief agents, were committed to custody.

But Shether presently despatcheth his servant to the bishop of Winchester, declaring how he and Serles were in durance, and recommended their case to him. Winchester went into the council-chamber, probably to try his interest with the council to get them released. But it seems he soon perceived how the king stood affected, and so there was nothing yet to be done, and therefore he told the servant, he could give him no answer as yet. A day or two after, at the servant's departing, he told him, "That his master was a child for weeping to the archbishop, when he should have answered; and that he should not weep for shame, but answer like a man; and that he should take a good heart, for he should have friends. That he would not forget him: but he must know of the council first what to do; and so desired the servant to have him recommended to the prebendaries all in general; bidding him tell them, that my Lord of Canterbury could not kill them, and that therefore they should bear their sufferings; for all he did was against himself, and that he should see what would come of it." Ford, a brother-in-law of Shether's, and a party, told the servant, "That he should tell his brother that he should never recant; for if he did, he would never be his friend while he lived, nor none should that he could let; and that my lord of Winchester should be his friend."

But to return to the archbishop's examination of them. When he asked them what the reason was of these their doings; they pretended one one thing and another another. Gardiner said, that which moved him was, because he observed such jarrings among them, and so much unquietness about matters of religion; and that he thought it was by the archbishop's sufferance, which the archbishop convinced him was false. Shether pretended that Baker, the chancellor of the Augmentations, had willed him to mark the chief fautors of new opinions. Willoughby desired Dr. Thornton, who was very great with the archbishop, but secretly false to him, that he would let his lordship know, that he never put up article against any man in his life; for that he was charged to have put up, or ready to have put up the articles. Thornton bad him stick to it, and not be afraid; for, saith he, I have spoken my mind to the council therein as I am bound, and so be you, being the king's chaplain.

But the archbishop left the further discovery of this mischief to the diligence of Cocks and Hussey, his officers. This was about August. They sat six weeks, saith my manuscript; but, being secret favourers of the Papists, handled the matter so, that nothing would be disclosed and espied, but everything colourably was hid. The archbishop secretly observed this; but Morice, his secretary, wrote to Dr. Butts, the king's physician, and Sir Anthony Denny, of his bedchamber, That if the king sent not some others to assist the archbishop than those that were with him, it was not possible anything should come to light; wishing that

Dr. Leigh, or some such other stout man, that had been exercised in the king's ecclesiastical affairs in his visitation, might be sent to him. And Dr. Leigh was soon despatched with instructions from the king into Kent, with the king's ring, which he delivered to the archbishop on Allhallow-even. And with Dr. Leigh, Dr. Rowland Taylor, another civilian, a bold and stirring man, was joined, who afterwards was burnt for his constancy in religion.

These new commissioners startled the delinquents; and they began to be very uneasy, and full of anger, as well as fear. One cried, "Thank my lord's grace; that is a way to have quietness in Kent, to have Dr. Leigh there." Of Dr. Taylor they said, "he was a man of an evil judgment, and notified for, and brought up in the same." And another, reflecting upon these men, said, "I would all ambitious knaves were hanged; I would all maintainers of new opinions were hanged; I would all knaves that break orders were hanged; I would all knaves that are against the commonwealth were hanged."

Hussey, the register, who had the examinations of these men, had private conferences with them; and let Serles and Sandwich (alias Gardiner) have the copies of their accusations, before they were to be called before Leigh, that they might the better know what answers to make.

But to proceed, to see what course Dr. Leigh took. Immediately upon his coming, according to the king's advice, he gave commission to about nine or ten of the archbishop's officers and gentlemen, such as were tried men of wit and audacity, to go and search the purses, chests, and houses of certain prebendaries and gentlemen, viz. such as were deemed or suspected to be of this confederacy, within the cathedral church and without; and what letters and writings they could find with them, to bring to the archbishop and him.

They all went about their work in the same hour; and within four hours after, the whole conspiracy was discovered, by finding of letters, some from the bishop of Winchester, some from Dr. London at Oxon, and from justices of the shire. In the chambers and chests of some gentlemen of the county were found letters serving to that purpose. And among the rest there came to the archbishop's hand two letters, one of Thornton, and the other of Dr. Barber; whom the archbishop retained with him in household for expedition of matters in suit before him, being his officer, and as a counsellor to him in the law when need required: both promoted by him; Thornton, who was suffragan of Dover, he made prebendary of his church, and whom he always set at his own mess. The archbishop taking them apart, showed them their letters, and upbraided them with their falseness and ingratitude. They fell down on their knees to the archbishop, and with many tears begged his pardon, acknowledging that they had been a year ago tempted to what they had done.

The archbishop before them, casting up his hands to heaven, applied himself to God, thanking him that he had, in the midst of so many enemies and false friends, vouchsafed him one great friend and master, meaning the king, without whose protection, as he said, he were not able to stand upright one day. He prayed God to make them good men, and bad them ask God forgiveness, seeing he had never deserved such usage at their hands. He added, that now he perceived there was no fidelity nor truth among men; and that he was brought to that point, that he feared his left hand would accuse his right: but that he needed not to marvel at it, seeing Christ prophesied of such a world to come in the latter days.[1] He prayed God of His mercy to finish that time shortly; and so dismissed them with gentle and comfortable words. And it was observed that there never after appeared, neither in his countenance nor his words, any remembrance thereof. But he thought fit no more to trust them; and so discharged them of his service. And so he did one Mr. Talbot, another false man, which was also of his counsel and chamber. But Dr. London took occasion hence to say, that they could tell a shrewd tale, if they were examined; and that it was not for nought they were put out of service; as though the reason were, that they should no more have opportunity of knowing any of the archbishop's doings or sayings.

All the foresaid seized papers and writings were put into a chest, and brought up to Lambeth; the king being minded to peruse them, and to punish the principals. In fine, divers of the chief of the knot were committed to prison, where they remained till the next year, some more closely confined than others; all during the archbishop's pleasure. All that the archbishop required of them was repentance and recantation, and an ingenuous confession of their faults and falseness to him. Abiding for some time under affliction, their spirits began to mollify; and then, by supplicatory letters to the archbishop, they begged his pardon, made their confessions, and desired their liberty.

---

[1] Mark xiii. 12: "The brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son: and children shall rise up against their parents," &c.

About which time a Parliament was at hand. Then great labour was made by their friends for a general pardon from the king, procuring him a subsidy, the easier to obtain it. Which indeed followed, and wiped away all punishment and correction for their fault. But without the king's indulgence they were like suddenly to have had their liberty by the archbishop's intercession for them, being a man that delighted not in revenge.

In the before-mentioned manuscript volume, belonging to Benet College, whence I have extracted most of these relations, are remaining the interrogatories prepared for Dr. London, wrote by the archbishop's own hand, together with the humble confessions and letters of Willoughby, Gardiner, Serles, Milles, Sentleger, and others concerned. Some of which I have transcribed into the Appendix.[1] Gardiner's expressions seemed so penitent, styling the archbishop his father, that it made such an impression upon the archbishop's heart, that when he saw him next, he told him, "You call me father; in good faith I will be a father to you indeed." Yet this very man, so ungrateful he was, that soon after this kind reconciliation of the archbishop to him, and (as it seems), his deliverance out of prison, he and the rest had fresh communications together again: insomuch that the archbishop was fain to enter upon a new trouble with them, putting them under restraint again, and interrogating them concerning their late communication. Unless this letter of Gardiner writ unto his grace may admit of a more favourable interpretation:—

"Most honourable father,—Unadvisedly, as God shall save me, I have offended your grace; and I think not the contrary, but that some back friend hath done me more hurt and hindrance than I have at your grace's hands deserved. For I know well in mine own conscience I have nothing so highly offended, as I do perceive that your grace is informed of me. In good faith I speak it of my conscience, and before God, I would I were under-ground. For now have I lost that, which I never thought to lose again: yea, that of which had I was as glad as ever I was of benefit received in this world, as knoweth my Saviour Christ Jesus; who preserve your grace.

---

[1] No. XXXIII.

"Yours,
"WILL. GARDINER."

But while these things were transacted at Canterbury, on the archbishop's behalf, against these false accusers, Dr. London, one of the great incendiaries, was censured at Windsor. For he, and one Symons, a lawyer, and Ockham, that laid traps for others, were catched at length themselves. They were men that busied themselves in framing indictments upon the Six Articles, against great numbers of those that favoured or professed the Gospel, and in sending them to court to Winchester, who was to prefer the complaints to the council. The king being more and more informed of their base conspiracies, and disliking their bloody dispositions, commanded the council should search into the matters. And so London and his fellows, being examined before the said council, were in the end found to be perjured in denying, upon their oaths, what they had indeed done, and was proved manifestly to their faces. Hereupon they were adjudged perjured persons, and appointed to ride through Windsor, Reading, and Newbury, where they had done most mischief, with their faces towards the horse-tail, and a paper upon their heads, declaring their crime; and to stand upon the pillory in each of those towns. And that punishment they underwent, and then were sent to the Fleet. London not long after died there, probably out of shame and sorrow. This was the end of one of these conspirators. German Gardiner was a year after hanged, drawn, and quartered, as a traitor, for denying the king's supremacy. And the bishop of Winchester after this never had favour or regard of the king more. And Heywood, another of the crew of the informers and witnesses, was condemned for treason with Gardiner, but making a recantation, his life was spared.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

The Archbishop falls into more Troubles.

AFTER this, the archbishop received two terrible shocks more, if I am right in the placing them, as I think I am, though I leave Fox to follow Morice, the archbishop's secretary, in his manuscript declaration of the said archbishop. The former was a complaint that was made openly against him in Parliament; and the latter, when the lords of the privy-council accused him unto the king, and required that he should be sent to the Tower.

Sir John Gostwick, a knight for Bedfordshire, a man of great service in his time, but Papistical, stood up in the house, and laid to his charge his sermons and lectures, both at Sandwich and Canterbury, containing, as he said, manifest heresy against the sacrament of the altar.[1] Though it was much they should accuse him in that point, seeing he then held a corporal presence; but it displeased them that it was after the Lutheran way, rather than after theirs of transubstantiation. But the king perceived easily this proceeded of malice, for that he was a stranger in Kent, and had neither heard the archbishop preach, nor read there. Knowing thereby that he was set on, and made an instrument to serve other men's purposes; the king marvellously stormed at the matter, calling Gostwick openly *varlet*, and said, "That he had played a villanous part, to abuse in open Parliament the primate of the realm, especially being in favour with his prince as he was. What will they do with him," said he, "if I were gone?" Whereupon the king sent word unto Gostwick, by one of his privy-chamber, after this sort:—"Tell the varlet Gostwick, that if he do not acknowledge his fault unto my lord of Canterbury, and so reconcile himself towards him that he may become his good lord, I will soon both make him a poor Gostwick, and otherwise punish him, to the example of others. He wondered," he said, "he could hear my lord of Canterbury preaching out of Kent: and that if he had been a Kentish-man, he might have had some more shadow to put up an accusation against him." Now Gostwick, hearing of this grievous threat, came with all possible speed unto Lambeth, and there submitted himself in such sorrowful case, that my lord out of hand not only forgave all his offences, but also went directly unto the king for the obtaining of the king's favour; which he obtained very hardly, and upon condition that the king might hear no more of his meddling that way.[1] This happened, I suppose, in the Parliament that began in January, and continued till March 29, 1544. The archbishop's palace at Canterbury was this year burnt [Dec. 18], and therein his brother-in-law, and other men, according to Stow.[2]

---

[1] MS. Declaration of Archbishop Cranmer.

I find no bishops consecrated in this year.

At length the confederacy of the papists in the privy-council (whereof I suspect the duke of Norfolk to be one, a great friend of Winchester's, by whose instigation this design was set on foot), came and accused him most grievously unto the king; "That he, with his learned men, had so infected the whole realm with their unsavoury doctrine, that three parts of the land were become abominable heretics: and that it might prove dangerous to the king, being like to produce such commotions and uproars as were sprung up in Germany. And therefore they desired, that the archbishop might be committed unto the Tower, until he might be examined." The king was very strait in granting this. They told him, "That the archbishop being one of the privy-council, no man dared to object matter against him, unless he were first committed to durance, which being done, men would be bold to tell the truth, and say their consciences." Upon this persuasion of theirs, the king granted unto them that they should call him the next day before them, and, as they saw cause, so to commit him to the Tower.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. p. 27.]

[2] [Annals, p. 584.]

At midnight, about eleven of the clock, before the day he should appear before the council, the king sent Mr. Denny to my lord at Lambeth, willing him incontinently to come over to Westminster to him. The archbishop was in bed, but rose straightway and repaired to the king, whom he found in the gallery at Whitehall. Being come, the king declared unto him what he had done, in giving liberty to the council to commit him to prison; for that they bare him in hand, that he and his learned men had sown such doctrine in the realm, that all men almost were infected with heresy; and that no man durst bring matter against him, being at liberty, and one of the council. And therefore I have granted to their request, said the king; but whether I have done well or no, what say you, my lord? The archbishop first humbly thanked the king that it had pleased him to give him that warning beforehand, and that he was very well content to be committed to the Tower for the trial of his doctrine, so that he might be indifferently heard; as he doubted not but that his Majesty would see him so to be used. Whereat the king cried out, "O Lord God, what fond simplicity have you, so to permit yourself to be imprisoned, that every enemy of yours may take advantage against you! Do not you know, that when they have you once in prison, three or four false knaves will soon be procured to witness against you, and condemn you; which else, now being at liberty, dare not once open their lips, or appear before your face? No, not so, my lord," said the king, "I have better regard unto you than to permit your enemies so to overthrow you; and therefore I will have you tomorrow come to the council, which no doubt will send for you; and when they break this matter unto you, require them, that, being one of them, you may have so much favour as they would have themselves; that is, to have your accusers brought before you. And if they stand with you, without regard of your allegations, and will in no condition condescend unto your request, but will needs commit you to the Tower, then appeal you from them to our person, and give to them this my ring (which he then delivered unto the archbishop); by the which," said the king, "they shall well understand that I have taken your cause into my hand from them. Which ring they well know, that I use it for no other purpose, but to call matters from the council into mine own hands, to be ordered and determined." And with this good advice Cranmer, after most humble thanks, departed from the king's majesty.

The next morning, according to the king's monition, and his own expectation, the council sent for him by eight of the clock in the morning. And when he came to the council-chamber door, he was not permitted to enter into the council-chamber, but stood without among serving-men and lackeys above three-quarters of an hour, many counsellors and others going in and out. The matter seemed strange unto his secretary, who then attended upon him; which made him slip away to Dr. Butts, to whom he related the manner of the thing, who by-and-by came, and kept my lord company. And yet, ere he was called into the council, Dr. Butts went to the king, and told him, that he had seen a strange sight. What is that? said the king. Marry, said he, my lord of Canterbury is become a lackey, or a serving-man: for to my knowledge he hath stood among them this hour almost at the council-chamber door. Have they served my lord so? "It is well enough," said the king; "I shall talk with them by-and-by." Anon Cranmer was called into the council; there it was declared unto him, that a great complaint was made of him, both to the king and to them, that he, and others by his permission, had infected the whole realm with heresy, and therefore it was the king's pleasure that they should commit him to the Tower, and there for his trial, to be examined. Cranmer required, as is before declared, with many, both reasons and persuasions, that he might have his accusers come there before them, before they used any further extremity against him. In fine, there was no entreaty could serve, but that he must needs depart to the Tower. "I am sorry, my lords," said Cranmer, "that you drive me unto this exigent, to appeal from you to the king's majesty, who by this token hath resumed this matter into his own hand, and dischargeth you thereof; and so delivered the king's ring unto them. By-and-by the Lord Russell swore a great oath, and said, "Did not I tell you, my lords, what would come of this matter? I know right well that the king would never permit my lord of Canterbury to have such a blemish as to be imprisoned, unless it were for high treason." And so, as the manner was, when they had once received that ring, they left off their matter, and went all unto the king's person, both with his token and the cause.

When they came unto his highness, the king said unto them, " Ah, my lords, I thought that I had had a discreet and wise council; but now I perceive that I am deceived. How have you handled here my lord of Canterbury? What make ye of him? A slave? shutting him out of the council-chamber among serving-men. Would ye be so handled yourselves?" And after such taunting words as these spoken, the king added, "I would you should well understand, that I account my lord of Canterbury as faithful a man towards me as ever was prelate in this realm, and one to whom I am many ways beholden, by the faith I owe unto God;" and so laid his hand upon his breast. " And therefore who loveth me," said he, " will upon that account regard him." And with these words all, and especially my lord of Norfolk, answered and said, " We meant no manner of hurt unto my lord of Canterbury, that we requested to have him in durance, which we only did, because he might, after his trial, be set at liberty to his greater glory." " Well," said the king, " I pray you use not my friends so. I perceive now well enough how the world goeth among you. There remaineth malice among you one to another; let it be avoided out of hand, I would advise you." And so the king departed, and the lords shook hands every man with the archbishop; against whom never more after durst any man spurn during King Henry's life. And because the king would have love always nourished between the lords of the council and the archbishop, he would send them divers times to dinner with him. And so he did after this reconciliation.[1]

Thus did the king interpose himself divers times between his archbishop and his irreconcileable enemies the Papists: and observing, by these essays against him, under what perils he was like to come hereafter for his religion, about this time it was, as I conjecture, that the king changed his coat of arms.[1] For unto the year 1543 he bore his paternal coat of three cranes sable, as I find by a date set under his arms, yet remaining in a window in Lambeth House. For it is to be noted, that the king, perceiving how much ado Cranmer would have in the defence of his religion, altered the three cranes, which were parcel of his ancestors' arms, into three pelicans, declaring unto him, "That those birds should signify unto him, that he ought to be ready, as the pelican is, to shed his blood for his young ones, brought up in the faith of Christ. For," said the king, "you are like to be tasted, if you stand to your tackling at length." As in very deed many and sundry times he was shouldered at, both in this king's reign, as you have heard, and under the two succeeding princes.

---

[1] [Strype drew the whole of this narrative from Fox's Acts and Monuments, as may be seen in vol. viii. p. 24, &c..]

CHAPTER XXIX.

Occasional Prayers and Suffrages.

Occasional prayers and suffrages, to be used throughout all churches, began now to be more usual than formerly. For these common devotions were twice this year appointed by authority, as they had been once the last; which I look upon the archbishop to be the great instrument in procuring: that he might by this means, by little and little, bring into use prayer in the English tongue, which he so much desired: and that the people, by understanding part of their prayers, might be the more desirous to have their whole service rendered intelligible; whereby God might be served with the more seriousness and true devotion.

The last year there was a plentiful crop upon the ground; but when the time of harvest drew near, there happened a great plague of rain. So in August letters were issued out from the king to the archbishop, that he should appoint certain prayers to be used for the ceasing of the wet weather; and to write to the rest of the province to do the like. But hear the king's letter:—

---

[1] Whereas it was conjectured there, that the king changed Archbishop Cranmer's coat of arms about 1544, it must have been several years before; for his new coat of the Pelicans may be seen in the frontispiece of the great English Bible, printed 1540. And how long before that time, I know not. [*From the Errata and Emendations to the first Edition.*]

"Most reverend father in God, right trusty, and right entirely beloved, we greet you well. And forasmuch as there hath been now a late, and still continueth, much rain, and other unseasonable weather, whereby is like to ensue great hurt and damage to the corn and fruits now ripe upon the ground, unless it shall please God, of his infinite goodness, to stretch forth his holy hand over us: considering, by sundry examples heretofore, that God, at the contemplation of earnest and devout prayers, oftentimes extended His mercy and grace; and hath also assuredly promised, that whensoever we call upon Him for things meet for us, He will grant unto us the same: we, having the governance and charge of His people committed unto us, have thought good to cause the same to be exhorted by you, and other the prelates of this our realm, with an earnest repentant heart for their iniquities, to call unto God for mercy; and with devout and humble prayer and supplication, every person, both by himself apart, and also by Common Prayer, to beseech Him to send unto us such seasonable and temperate weather, to have in those fruits and corn on the ground, which hitherto he hath caused so plenteously to grow.

"For the which purpose we require you, and nevertheless command you, to send unto all your brethren, the bishops within your province, to cause such general rogations and processions to be made incontinently within their dioceses, as in case like heretofore hath been accustomed in this behalf accordingly.

"Yeven under our signet, at our manor of the Moor, the 20th day of August, the xxxv. year of our reign."[1]

The archbishop accordingly sent his order, dated August 23, 1543, to Edmund [Bonner] bishop of London, that there might be prayers and supplications in his diocese every fourth and sixth days of the week. And the like order was despatched to all the other bishops in his province; "by their prayers, as was accustomed, to implore God's mercy to avert his wrath, that the people had justly deserved.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. 22 a.

And not to cease their prayers and suffrages till further order from him."

It is not so evident that these prayers were in the English tongue: but in the year following, viz. 1544, there were, without controversy, certain suffrages drawn up in our mother-tongue by the archbishop's means, which he intended to be universally observed everywhere. Upon the archbishop's pious motions, as it seems, the king issued out his letters to him, dated in June, for the publication of these prayers in English, to be from thenceforth continually used in the church; together with setting forth the king's injunctions, by preaching and good exhortation, that the people, who before did but slackly observe their devotions, for want of understanding the divine service, might henceforth more frequently and more fervently resort to religious worship.

I shall not here set down the king's letter, as I transcribed it out of Archbishop Cranmer's Register,[1] because Bishop Burnet hath printed it already in his first volume, among the Collections, page 264.[2] It runs in such a pious strain, as though none but the archbishop had been the suggester thereof: "That since at that time Christendom was plagued with wars, hatred, and dissensions, and in no place was peace and agreement; and since it was out of the power of man to redress these miseries, God alone being able to restore peace, and unite men's hearts; therefore the king was resolved to have general processions used in all churches, with all reverence and devotion of the people. And because they not understanding the prayers and suffrages formerly used, caused that the people came but slackly to the processions; therefore the king now had published certain prayers in our native tongue, which he, with his present letter, had sent to the archbishop, for the special trust and confidence he had of his godly mind, and the earnest desire that was in him for the setting forth of God's glory, and the true worshipping of his name. And that these prayers should not be observed for a month or two, as his other injunctions had been, but that they, together with the injunctions, should be earnestly set forth by preaching, good exhortation, and otherwise; in such sort as they might feel the godly taste thereof, and godly and joyously with thanks receive, embrace, and frequent the same. Commanding the archbishop, that he should not only cause the same suffrages to be used in his own diocese, but signify the king's pleasure in this regard to all other bishops of his province. And that he should have a special respect thereunto; and make report if any did not with good dexterity accomplish the same. It was given under the king's signet, at his manor of St. James', June 11, in the 36th of his reign." I have not met with these suffrages, which if I had, I should have been inclined to publish them here; and the rather, because I believe they were of Cranmer's own composing.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. fol. 48.

[2] [Vol. i. part. ii. b. iii. No. 28, p. 398.]

According to this letter, the archbishop dispersed his letters to Edmund [Bonner] bishop of London, and the other bishops, with a copy of the suffrages to be used: urging withal, the observation of all the king's injunctions heretofore promulgated for the confirming and establishing of sacred religion.

About August this year, the king was upon going himself in person to invade France, against which nation he was now in hostility, and had prepared a mighty army by land and sea for that purpose. Now the archbishop was again called upon by the privy councillors to appoint processions in the English tongue through the realm, for the king's good success in this great expedition. The council's letter ran in this tenor:—

"After our right hearty commendations to your good lordship: these shall be to signify to the same, that the king's highness having so provided for the safety of his grace's realm, as the great malice of his enemies shall, by the grace of God, take small effect, for the repulsing of which his highness hath in a readiness to set abroad, at the furthest on Wednesday next, such a puissant navy as hath not been seen assembled in the remembrance of man: considering nevertheless that all victories and good successes come only at the direction and appointment of God, following herein that trade of such a Christian prince as he is, hath devised to have processions throughout the realm, in such sort as in like cases hath heretofore laudably been accustomed. Requiring your lordship, therefore, to take order incontinently, and from henceforth, through your province, the said processions be kept continually upon the accustomed days, and none otherwise; and sung or said, as the number of the quire shall serve for the same, in the English tongue; to the intent that there may be an uniformity in every place. Whereby it may please God at all times to prosper his majesty in all his affairs: and the rather, to have regard at this time unto the uprightness of his grace's quarrel, and to send his highness victorious success of the same. And thus we bid your Lordship most heartily well to fare. From Petworth, the 10th day of August.

"Your lordship's assured loving friends,
"W. ESSEX, ST. WYNTON, ANT. BROWN, WILL. PAGET."[1]

The copy of this letter the archbishop despatched to [Bonner] the bishop of London; and, in a letter of his own, he first stirred him up to take care of making due provisions for the religious performance of these prayers in his diocese, upon consideration of the king's great wars by land and sea, and his wars in France, in Scotland, and in the parts about Boulogne. Then he enjoined him, and all the bishops in his province, every fourth and sixth day, to retire to prayer and supplication to God; and that the people should, as he wrote, "Concinna modulatione et una voce cunctipotentem Deum Sabaoth, omnis victoriæ largitorem unicum, sancte et pie, non labiis, sed corde puro adorent." "In becoming harmony, and with one voice, holily and piously, not with the lips, but with a pure heart, adore the Almighty God of Sabaoth, the only giver of all victory."

And in these smaller matters our archbishop was fain now to be contented to busy himself, since about this juncture Winton [*i.e.* Gardiner] or his party had the ascendant, and did all at court. Concerning these latter times of King Henry, when the Popish bishops carried all before them again; and the acts of Parliament that were made, whereby the bishops were empowered to call sessions as oft as they would, to try those that gave not due obedience to the superstitions of the Church, and that upon pain of treason; thus John Bale complains, whose words may give us some light into the sad condition of these times: "Still remaineth there foul masses, of all abominations the principal, their prodigious sacrifices, their censing of idols, their boyish processions, their uncommanded worshippings, and their confessions in the ear, of all traitory the fountain, with many other strange observations, which the Scripture of God knoweth not. Nothing is brought as yet to Christ's clear institution and sincere ordinance, but all remaineth still as the antichrists left it. Nothing is tried by God's word, but by the ancient authority of fathers: now passeth all under their title. Though the old bishops of Rome were of late years proved antichrists, and their names razed out of our books, yet must they thus properly, for old acquaintance, be called still our fathers. If it were naught afore, I think it is now much worse: for now are they become laudable ceremonies, whereas beforetime they were but ceremonies alone. Now are they become *necessary rights*, *godly constitutions*, *seemly usages*, and *civil ordinances*, whereas afore they had no such names. And he that disobeyeth them shall not only be judged a felon, and worthy to be hanged by their new-forged laws, but also condemned for a traitor against his king, though he never in his life hindered, but rather to his power hath furthered, the commonwealth. To see this also with such like put in execution, the bishops have authority every month in the year, if they list, to call a session, to hang and burn at their pleasure. And this is ratified and confirmed by act of Parliament to stand the more in effect."[1]

---

[1] Regist. Cran. 26 b.

Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, had, by his policy and interest, brought things thus backward again, and exalted the power of the bishops, that of late years had been much eclipsed. And so he plainly told one Seton, a man of eminence in these times both for piety and learning in London, who met with troubles there, about the year 1541, for a sermon preached at St. Anthony's against justification by works. This Seton being now it seems fallen into new troubles, and brought before the aforesaid bishop, when he was able no longer to withstand the manifest truth, said to him, "Mr. Seton, we know ye are learned, and plenteously endued with knowledge in the Scriptures; yet think not that ye shall overcome us. No, no, set your heart at rest, and look never to have it said, that ye have overcome the bishops; for it shall not be so."

---

[1] [See Parker Society's edition of Bishop Bale's Select Works, "The Image of both Churches," paraphrase ii. on Rev. xiii. 3, p. 427, by which the text has been corrected.]

Robert Holgate, bishop of Landaff, was this year preferred to the see of York. His confirmation is mentioned in the archbishop of Canterbury's Register, wherein is set down an oath, which he then took, of renunciation of the Pope, and acknowledgment of the king's supremacy, very full and large. Afterwards I find the same oath administered to Kitchin, elect of Landaff, and Ridley, elect of Rochester, and Farrar, of St. David's. But I think it not unworthy to be here set down as I find it, seeming to be a new form drawn up, to be henceforth taken by all bishops. And this archbishop of York the first that took it.

"I, Robert, archbishop of York elect, having now the veil of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction of the see and bishop of Rome, clearly taken away from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that neither the see nor the bishop of Rome, nor any foreign potestate, hath, nor ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, or authority within this realm, neither by God's law, nor by any just law or means. And though, by sufferance and abusions in time past, they aforesaid have usurped and vindicated a feigned and unlawful power and jurisdiction within this realm, which hath been supported till few years past; therefore, because it might be denied and thought thereby that I took or take it for just and good, I therefore do now clearly and frankly renounce, forsake, refuse, and relinquish that pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction, both of the see and bishop of Rome, and of all other foreign powers: and that I shall never consent or agree that the foresaid see or bishop of Rome, or any of their successors, shall practise, exercise, or have any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power within this realm, or any other the king's realms or dominions; nor any foreign potestate, of what state, degree, or condition he be; but that I shall resist the same to the uttermost of my power; and that I shall bear faith, troth, and true allegiance to the king's majesty, and to his heirs and successors declared, or hereafter to be declared, by the authority of the act made in the sessions of his Parliament, holden at Westminster, the 14th day of January, in the 35th year,[1] and in the act made in the 28th year of the king's majesty's reign.[2] And that I shall accept, repute, and take the king's majesty, his heirs and successors, when they, or any of them, shall enjoy his place, to be the only supreme head in earth, under God, of the Church of England and Ireland, and all other his highness' dominions. And that with my body, cunning, wit, and uttermost of my power, without guile, fraud, or other undue means, I shall observe, keep, maintain, and defend all the king's majesty's styles, titles, and rights, with these effects and contents of the acts provided for the same, and all other acts and statutes made and to be made within this realm, in and for that purpose, and the derogation, extirpation, and extinguishment of the usurped and pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction of the see and bishop of Rome, and all other foreign potestates as afore. And also as well the said statute made in the said 28th year, as the statute made in the [said session of the] Parliament holden in the 35th year of the king's majesty's reign, for establishment and declaration of his highness' succession, and all acts and statutes made and to be made in confirmation and corroboration of the king's majesty's power and supremacy in earth, of his Church of England and of Ireland, and other his grace's dominions; I shall also defend and maintain, with my body and goods, with all my wit and power. And thus I shall do against all manner of persons, of what state, dignity, degree, or condition they be; and in no wise do nor attempt, nor to my power suffer, or know to be done or attempted, directly or indirectly, any thing or things privily or apertly to the let, hinderance, damage, or derogation of any of the said statutes, or any part thereof, by any manner of means, or for or by any manner of pretence. And in case any oath hath been made by me to any person or persons in maintenance, defence, or favour of the bishop of Rome, or his authority, jurisdiction, or power, or against any the statutes aforesaid, I repute the same as vain and adnichilate. I shall wholly observe and keep this oath. So help me God, all saints, and the holy Evangelists."[1]

---

[1] [This was intituled, "The Act concerning the Establishment of the King's Majesty's Succession," 35 Hen. VIII. cap. i.]

[2] [Intituled, "An Act for the Establishment of the Succession of the Imperial Crown of this Realm," 28 Hen. VIII. cap. 7.]

And then, after this oath, followed the prayers before the benediction of the pall, and the ceremonies of delivering it.

CHAPTER XXX.

The Archbishop reformeth the Canon Law.

Our archbishop, seeing the great evil and inconvenience of canons and Papal laws which were still in force, and studied much in the kingdom, had in his mind now a good while to get them suppressed, or to reduce them into a narrower campass, and to cull out of them a set of just and wholesome laws, that should serve for the government of the ecclesiastical state. And indeed there was great need of some reformation of these laws; for most of them extolled the Pope unmeasurably, and made his power to be above that of emperors and kings. Some of them were, "That he that acknowledged not himself to be under the bishop of Rome, and that the Pope is ordained of God to have the primacy over the world, is an heretic. That princes' laws, if they be against the canons and decrees of the bishop of Rome, be of no force. That all the decrees of the bishop of Rome ought to be kept perpetually, as God's word spoken by the mouth of Peter. That all kings, bishops, and noblemen, that believe or suffer the bishop of Rome's decrees in any thing to be violated, are accursed." That the see of Rome hath neither spot nor wrinkle; and abundance of the like, which the archbishop himself drew out of the canon laws, and are set down by the bishop of Sarum in his history.[2]

Therefore, by the archbishop's motion and advice, the king had an act passed the last year, viz. 1544,[1] "That his majesty should have authority, during his life, to name thirty-two persons; that is to say, sixteen spiritual and sixteen temporal, to examine all canons, constitutions, and ordinances, provincial and synodal, and to draw up such laws ecclesiastical as should be thought by the king and them convenient to be used in all spiritual courts." According to this act, though it seems this nomination happened some time before the making of the same, the king nominated several persons to study and prepare a scheme of good laws for the Church, who brought their business to a conclusion, and so it rested for a time. The archbishop being now to go down into Kent, to meet some commissioners at Sittingbourne, went to Hampton Court, to take his leave of the king: there he put him in mind of these ecclesiastical laws, and urged him to ratify them. So the king bade him despatch to him the names of the persons (which had been chiefly left to Cranmer's election), and the book they had made. This care he, going out of town, left with Hethe, bishop of Rochester.

---

[1] Cranmer's Regist. 309 a.

[2] Part i. Among the Collections, p. 257 [vol. i. part ii. b. iii. No. xxvii. pp. 391—398. See also Parker Society's edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. pp. 68—75, where Burnet's draft has been cor-

So that these laws, by the great pains of the archbishop and some learned men about him, were brought to that good perfection that they wanted nothing but the confirmation of the king. And there was a letter drawn up ready for that purpose for the king to sign. It was directed to all archbishops, bishops, abbots, clerks, dukes, marquises, earls, barons, knights, and gentlemen, and all others, of whatsoever degree, his subjects and liegemen; giving them to understand, "That in the room of the corrupt laws, decrees, and statutes, that proceeded from the bishops of Rome, which were all abolished, he had put forth by his authority another set

rected from the Lambeth and C.C.C. Cambridge MSS. This "Collection of Tenets from the Canon Law" cannot be too carefully studied by Protestants of every religious denomination at the present time, when Dr. Wiseman has had the insolence to set up "the Canon law" in this country, in contravention of the Queen's Majesty's authority. In the compass of eight pages it will be seen what are the extravagant, unscrupulous, and persecuting dogmas of the Church of Rome, which are just as much in force at the present time as they were in the reign of Henry VIII. and during the archbishopric of Cranmer.]

[1] [Intituled, "A Bill for the Examination of Canon Laws by thirty-two persons, to be named by the King's Majesty," 35 Henry VIII. cap. 16.]

of ecclesiastical laws, which he required to be observed, under pain of his indignation." The copy of this letter may be read in the Appendix.[1] But whatsoever the matter was, whether it were the king's other business, or the secret oppositions of Bishop Gardiner and the Papists, this letter was not signed by the king.

I have seen the digest of these ecclesiastical laws in a manuscript in folio, fairly written out by the archbishop's secretary, with the title to each chapter prefixed, and the index of the chapters at the beginning, both of the archbishop's own hand.[2] In many places there be his own corrections and additions, and sometimes a cross by him struck through divers lines. And so he proceeded a good way in the book. And where the archbishop left off, Peter Martyr went on, by his order, to revise the rest in the method he had begun. And in the title, *De Præscriptionibus*, the greatest part of the seventh chapter is Martyr's own writing, viz. beginning at this word *Rumpitur*, which is in page 248 of the printed book, line 23, and so to the end of the chapter.[3] So that this manuscript, I conjecture, was the first draught of these laws, prepared in the reign of King Henry, and revised in the reign of King Edward his successor, when Peter Martyr was appointed by that king's letters to be one of those that were to be employed in this work; who was much at this time with the archbishop. In this draught were several chapters afterwards added, partly by Cranmer, and partly by Martyr. There was yet a latter and more perfect draught of these laws, as they were completed and finished in King Edward's reign. This draught fell into the possession of Archbishop Parker; from whence he published the book in the year 1571, intituling it, "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, &c." which was printed again in the year 1640. Both these manuscript draughts were diligently compared together by John Fox; and the main difference seemed to consist in putting the latter into a new method, and placing the titles differently.

For in this matter Cranmer was much busied in King Edward's reign also, being greatly desirous to bring that good work to perfection. For he thought it greatly inconvenient, when the Pope's power was abrogated, that his laws should remain in force; holding it highly necessary that the nation might have a body of wholesome laws for the good administration of justice in the spiritual courts. Wherefore he procured, in the fifth year of that king, letters commissional to him, and seven more, diligently to set about the perusal of the old church laws; and then to compile such a body of laws as should seem, in their judgments, most expedient to be practised in the ecclesiastical courts and jurisdictions: these seven were, Thomas Goodrick, bishop of Ely; Richard Cox, the king's almoner; Peter Martyr, William May, Rowland Taylor, John Lucas, and Richard Goodrick. But the matter was in effect wholly intrusted by the king to the archbishop, who associated to himself in the active part of this work Taylor, Martyr, and Haddon. The method they observed in managing this affair was, that after they had finished a title, and drawn it up, it was then sent to Dr. Haddon, who was a civilian, and an accurate Latinist, to peruse; and if anything was less elegantly expressed, to correct it. So I find at the title *De Decimis*, these words writ by Cranmer:—"This is finished by us, but must be overseen again by Dr. Haddon." Thus, for instance, I observe these corrections by Haddon's pen in the chapter entitled, *De Commodis quæ perveniunt a sacris ritibus:* instead of "Gratiarum actionis mulierum a partu," he corrected it, "Levatarum puerperarum;" and in another place, "Cuicunque hoc prærogativum est," instead of "hoc prærogativum," he put, "hoc peculiare jus tribuitur, quod prærogativum vocant." But his corrections are very few, and but of words less proper. The work and words were mainly Cranmer's own. But all this great and long labour of the archbishop came to no effect by reason of the king's untimely death, and it may be, the secret opposition of Papists.

---

[1] No. XXXIV.

[2] Inter Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxxvi].

[3] "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiat."—Lond. 1640.

At the same time that he, being at Hampton Court, dealt with the king concerning the reformation of the canon laws, he also gave him an account of a business his Majesty had employed him in, and with him also Hethe and Day, bishops of Worcester and Chichester, and some other of his chaplains, and learned men, whom he had of late appointed, with the archbishop, to peruse certain books of service, delivered by the king to them, wherein there were many superstitions fit to be amended. Which the archbishop, in the name of the rest, at this time acquainted the king with: as namely, the vigil, and ringing of bells all the night long upon Allhallow-night; and the covering of images in the church in the time of Lent, with the lifting the veil that covereth the cross on Palm-Sunday, and kneeling to the cross at the same time. He moved the king in his own name, and the name of the rest, that these things might be abolished, and the superstitions, and other enormities and abuses of the same. And that because all other vigils, which in the beginning of the Church were godly used; yet for the manifold superstitions and abuses, which did after grow by means of the same, were many years past taken away throughout Christendom, and there remained nothing but the name of the vigil in the calendar, saving only upon Allhallow-day at night, he moved that it might be observed no more. And because creeping to the cross was a greater abuse than any of the other (for there the people said, "Crucem tuam adoramus, Domine:" and the Ordinal saith, "Procedant clerici ad crucem adorandam nudis pedibus:" and it followeth in the said Ordinal, "Ponatur crux ante aliquod altare, ubi a populo adoretur:" which by the bishop's book, intituled, "A necessary Instruction," is against the second commandment); therefore he desired of the king, that the creeping to the cross might also cease hereafter.

These superstitious usages were allowed in the articles of religion put forth anno 1536, Cranmer then not having interest enough to procure the laying them aside, or thinking it then not a fitting season to attempt it, as being in vain to oppose what the king himself at that time approved of. But now the king listened to the archbishop, and bade him confer with [Hethe] the bishop of Worcester, and send to him their thoughts, what course they would advise him to take for redress. The archbishop accordingly consulted with the said bishop, who then went along with Cranmer in the Reformation. The effect of which was, as the archbishop wrote to the king soon after from Beakesbourne, "That his Majesty should send his letters to both the archbishops to reform these superstitions; and they to send in the king's name to all the prelates within their respective provinces to the same purpose." The archbishop withal sent to the king the minutes of a letter to be sent to him, the said archbishop, to that intent. He also advised the king, that at the same time that this alteration was commanded to be made, he should set forth some doctrine, which should declare the cause of the abolishing these usages, for the satisfaction of the consciences of the people. For he knew well, as he wrote, that the people would think the honour of Christ was taken away, when this honouring of the cross was taken away, and therefore that they should need some good instruction herein. He nominated the bishops of Worcester [Hethe] and Chichester [Day], and some other his grace's chaplains, for the preparing this: "and this," he said, "would make the people obey him without murmuring; nay, be thankful to him for showing them the truth: and it would be a satisfaction to other nations, when they should see the king do nothing but by the authority of God's word, and for the setting forth of God's honour, and not the diminishing thereof." This letter of the archbishop to the king is extant in the [State] paper-office, whence the bishop of Sarum extracted a copy.[1]

These things were agitated in [Gardiner] the bishop of Winchester's absence, whom the king had sent ambassador this year, with [Thirlby] the bishop of Westminster, to Charles, the emperor, about the mediation of a peace between England and France. The archbishop took this occasion to move the king in these good purposes for a further reformation of abuses in religion; towards the which the king appeared to be in so good a mind, Winchester being absent, who, if he had been at home, would undoubtedly have done his endeavour to put a check to these attempts. But it must be attributed to his being abroad, that the king gave an ear to the archbishop, and appointed a set of more moderate bishops and divines to prepare matter for his allowance and ratification. But Winchester, though at a distance, had information of these designs by his intelligencers; and by making the king believe that, if he suffered any innovations in religion to proceed, the emperor would withdraw his mediation for a league; by these crafty means of this man, these good motions proceeded no further.[1]

---

[1] [Burnet's] Hist. Ref. vol. ii. Collect. p. 236 [vol. ii. part ii. b. i. No. 61, p. 332].

So that there were two abuses in religion which our archbishop, by time and seasonable inculcation, brought the king off from. He had a very great esteem for images in churches, and for the worship used to the cross; and many disputations and discourses happened between the king and the archbishop concerning them. Once at the king's palace at Newhall in Essex, Canterbury and Winchester being alone with the king, a talk happened about images, and the arguments that were used for abolishing them were considered. The archbishop, who built all his arguments upon the word of God, produced the second commandment, and thence he raised his argument. But the king discussed it as a commandment relating only to the Jews, and not to us; as Winchester relates in one of his letters to the duke of Somerset; adding (because the reasoning was so much to his own mind), "That the king so discussed it, that all the clerks in Christendom could not amend it." And when, at another time, one had used arguments against the image of the Trinity, whether Cranmer, or some else, I know not, Winchester heard the king answer them too: so possessed was the king once with an opinion of retaining them; and yet at length, by the archbishop's wise and moderate carriage and speeches, the king was brought to another opinion, and to give his orders for the abolishing of a great many of them; namely, of such as had been abused. But when he had done this, he would not forego the other, but commanded kneeling and creeping to the cross. And gross was the superstition that was committed in this blind devotion; which the king, by the archbishop's means, being at length sensible of, was prevailed with that this also should no more be used, as you heard before.

There was one thing more this careful archbishop recommended to the king this year. He was troubled for his cathedral church of Canterbury, observing how the revenues of it were diminished and made away daily by the prebendaries thereof, to satisfy the insatiable greediness of the laity, and it may be their own too. And the courtiers and others were hard to be withstood, when they were minded to rake from the Church. The practice was, that when any were minded to get a portion of land from the Church, they would first engage the king therein, and so the Church was to make it over to him; and then by gift, or for some trifling consideration, as a sale, it was conveyed to them from the king. Nay, sometimes they would use the king's name, without his knowledge.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 562.

Cranmer had the honesty and the courage to make complaint of this abuse and injury done to the revenues of the cathedral. "That those of the Church, to their disquietment, and also great charges, did alienate their lands daily, as it was said, by the king's commandment; but he was sure," he said, "that others had gotten the best lands, and not his Majesty. Therefore he sued, that when his Majesty was minded to have any of their lands, that they might have some letters from him to declare his pleasure, without the which they were sworn to make no alienation: and that the same alienations might not be made at other men's pleasures, but only to his Majesty's use." By which means, it is likely, the prebendaries had more quiet possession of their lands for the time to come.

By this time the archbishop had compassed two very good things, in order to the furthering the common people in knowledge and true religion. The one was, that he brought in among the laity a more common use of the Scriptures; and the other, that sermons were more frequently preached than had been before. But both these, to the grief of the archbishop, were sadly abused; for now the contending of preachers in their pulpits, one against another, grew more and more, and became most scandalous. So that few preached the word of God truly and sincerely, but ran almost wholly upon matters controverted; and in that railing manner, that their expressions were very provoking. So that this came to the sowing of discord among the people, instead of promoting love, unity, and solid religion. The laity, on the other hand, some of them railed much on the bishops, and spoke contemptibly of the priests, and taunted the preachers. The Scriptures were much read, but the effect of it appeared too much in their making use of it only for jangling and disputation upon points of religion, and to taunt at the ignorance or error of priests.

Others, on the other hand, to be even with the gospellers, made it their business to derogate from the Scripture, to deal with it irreverently, and to rhyme and sing, and make sport with it in alehouses and taverns. These things came to King Henry's ears, which made him very earnestly blame both the laity and spirituality for it, in a speech which he made at the dissolution of his Parliament this year.[1]

A Bishop confirmed.

Anthony Kitchin, alias Dunstan, D.D., was elected and confirmed bishop of Landaff, May 2. The archbishop sent his commissional letters, dated the same day, to Thomas [Thirlby] bishop of Westminster for his consecration: but the consecration is not entered in the Register.[2] His oath to the king began thus: "I Anthony Kitchin, elect bishop of Landaff, having now the veil of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction of the see and bishop of Rome clearly taken away from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my heart, that neither the see nor the bishop of Rome, nor any foreign potestate, hath, or ought to have," &c. as before.[3]

Another proclamation was set out the next year (which was the last issued out under this king), prohibiting again Tindal's and Coverdale's English New Testament, or any other than what was permitted by Parliament; and also the English books of Wickliff, Frith, &c.; the king being vexed with the contests and clamours of the people one against another, while they disputed so much of what they read, and practised so little.

A small matter oftentimes creates great brabblings and contentions in fraternities. Such a small thing now occurred in the archbishop's church. Two of the prebends were minded to change houses; but the rest, it seems, made some opposition, as reckoning it contrary to a certain statute of that church. The archbishop hearing hereof, seasonably interposed, and interpreted their statute for them. The preachers also of this church seem not to have been fairly dealt with by the prebends, both as to their lodgings and benefits, but at a late chapter they had obtained an order in their behalf. This the archbishop now, who favoured preaching, reminded them speedily to make good. Concerning both these affairs, he wrote this letter to them for the preserving quietness, peace, and good order in his church:—

---

[1] Vid. Herb. Hist. p. 600.

[2] ["Strype has here fallen into an error; in Cranm. Reg. fol. 310, b, it is stated by Anthony Huse, the registrar, that Kitchin was consecrated in his presence, and that of others, by the bishop of Westminster (Thirlby), assisted by the suffragan bishops of Sidon and Salop." Eccl. History, Society's edition, vol. i. p. 516.]

[3] [p. 188.]

"After my hearty commendations: whereas I am informed that you be in doubt whether any prebendary of that my church may exchange his house or garden with another prebend of the same church-living, and that you be moved by this statute so to think, which here followeth; 'Statuimus ut canonicus de novo electus, et demissus in demortui, aut resignantis, aut quovismodo cedentis ædes succedat.' These be to signify unto you, that neither this statute, nor any other reason that I know, maketh anything against the exchange between two prebends living, but that they may change house, orchard, or garden during their life, this statute or any other reason contrary notwithstanding. And whereas you have appointed your preachers at your last chapter their chambers and commodities, I require you that they may be indelayedly admitted thereunto, according to that your order. Thus fare you well. From my manor of Croyden, the 12th of December, 1546.

"TH. CANTUARIENS.

"To my loving friends the Vice-dean and
Prebendaries of my church in Canterbury."[1]

This was the last year of King Henry; and the two last things the archbishop was concerned in by the king were these. The king commanded him to pen a form for the alteration of the mass into a communion. For a peace being concluded between Henry and the French king, while that king's ambassador, Dr. Annehault, was here, a notable treaty was in hand by both kings for the promoting that good piece of reformation in the churches of both kingdoms, of abolishing the mass. The king seemed to be firmly resolved thereon, intending to exhort the emperor to do the same. The work our king committed to the archbishop, who no question undertook it very gladly; but the death of the king prevented this taking effect.[1]

---

[1] Ex Regist. Eccles. Christ. Cant.

The last office the archbishop did for the king his master was to visit him in his last sickness, whom of all his bishops and chaplains he chose to have with him at that needful hour, to receive his last comfort and counsel. But the king was void of speech when he came, though not of sense and apprehension. For when the king took him by the hand, the archbishop speaking comfortably to him, desired him to give him some token that he put his trust in God through Jesus Christ, according as he had advised him; and thereat the king presently wrung hard the archbishop's hand, and soon after departed, viz. January the 28th.[2]

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 562.]

[2] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 689.]

The end of the first Book.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

He crowns King Edward.

Our archbishop, having lost his old master, was not so sorrowful but the hopefulness of the new one did as much revive and solace him; because he concluded, that the matters requisite for the reformation of the Church were like now to go on more roundly, and with less impediment.

One of the very first things that was done in young King Edward the Sixth's reign, in relation to the Church, was, that the bishops, who had the care of ecclesiastical matters and the souls of men, should be made to depend entirely upon the king and his council, and to be subject to suspension from their office, and to have their whole episcopal power taken from them at his pleasure; which might serve as a bridle in case they should oppose the proceedings of a reformation. In this I suppose the archbishop had his hand: for it was his judgment, that the exercise of all episcopal jurisdiction depended upon the prince: and that, as he gave it, so he might restrain it at his pleasure. And therefore he began this matter with himself, petitioning, "That as he had exercised the authority of an archbishop during the reign of the former king; so that authority ending with his life, it would please the present King Edward to commit unto him that power again." For it seemed that he would not act as archbishop till he had a new commission from the new king for so doing. And that this was his judgment appeared in the first words of that commission granted to him; in the composing of which I make no question he had his hand. "Quandoquidem omnis juris dicendi autoritas, atque etiam jurisdictio omnimoda, tam illa quæ ecclesiastica dicitur, quam secularis, a regia potestate, velut a supremo capite, ac omnium magistratuum infra regnum nostrum fonte et scaturigine, primitus emanaverit," &c. That is, "Since all authority of exercising jurisdiction, and also all kind of jurisdiction, as well that which is called ecclesiastical as secular, originally hath flowed from the king's power, as from the supreme head, and the fountain and source of all magistracy within our kingdom: we therefore in this part yielding to your humble supplications, and consulting for the good of our subjects, have determined to commit our place to you, under the manner and form hereunder described."[1] And the king then licenseth him to ordain within his diocese, and to promote and present to ecclesiastical benefices; and to institute and invest; and, if occasion required, to deprive; to prove testaments, and the rest of the business of his courts. And so all the rest of his offices were reckoned. This was dated February 7, 1546. But yet all these things were committed to him, with a power of revocation of the exercise of this authority reserved in the king, *et durante beneplacito.* Thus a formal commission was made to him; I do not transcribe it, because the bishop of Sarum hath saved me that pains.[2] And hence I find, that the archbishop, in some of his writings, is styled "The Commissary of our dread sovereign lord King Edward."

One of the first exercises of his episcopal power was the coronation of young King Edward; which was celebrated February the 20th, at the abbey of Westminster, the archbishop assisting now at his coronation, as he had done about nine years before at his christening, when he stood his godfather. The form and solemnity of it, and wherein the archbishop bore so great a part, was in this manner, as I collect and transcribe out of a manuscript in Benet College.[3]

First, there was a goodly stage, richly hanged with cloth of gold and cloth of arras; and the steps from the choir contained two and twenty steps of height; and down to the high altar but fifteen steps, goodly carpeted, where the king's grace should tread on, with his nobles.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [28].

[2] [Burnet's] Hist. Ref. part ii. Coll. p. 90 [vol. ii. part ii. b. i. No. 2, p. 131].

[3] C.C.C.C. Library Miscellan. B.

Secondly. The high altar richly garnished with divers and costly jewels and ornaments of much estimation and value. And also the tombs on each side the high altar richly hanged with fine gold arras.

Thirdly. In the midst of the stage was a goodly thing made of seven steps of height, all round, where the king's majesty's chair-royal stood; and he sat therein, after he was crowned, all the mass-while.

Fourthly. At nine of the clock all Westminster choir was in their copes, and three goodly crosses before them: and after them other three goodly rich crosses, and the king's chapel with his children, following all in scarlet, with surplices and copes on their backs. And after them ten bishops in scarlet with their rochets, and rich copes on their backs, and their mitres on their heads, did set forth at the west door of Westminster towards the king's palace, there to receive his grace; and my lord of Canterbury with his cross before him alone, and his mitre on his head. And so passed forth in order, as before is said. And within a certain space after were certain blue cloths laid abroad in the church-floor against the king's coming, and so all the palace, even to York-place.

Then is described the setting forward to Westminster church to his coronation, unction, and confirmation.

After all the lords in order had kneeled down and kissed his grace's right foot, and after held their hands between his grace's hands, and kissed his grace's left cheek, and so did their homage; then began a mass of the Holy Ghost by my lord of Canterbury, with good singing in the choir, and organs playing. There at offering-time his grace offered to the altar a pound of gold, a loaf of bread, and a chalice of wine.

Then, after the elevation of the mass, there was read by [Wriothesley] my lord chancellor, in presence of all the nobles, a general pardon granted by King Henry the Eighth, father to our liege lord the king, that all shall be pardoned that have offended before the 28th day of January last past.

When the king's majesty, with his nobles, came to the place of the coronation, within a while after, his grace was removed into a chair of crimson velvet, and borne in the chair between two noblemen unto the north side of the stage, and showed to the people; and these words spoken to the people by my lord of Canterbury, in this manner, saying: "Sirs, here I present unto you King Edward, the rightful inheritor to the crown of this realm, [whose coronation, unction, and confirmation is this day appointed by the nobles of the realm]. Wherefore all ye that be come this day to do your homage, service, and bounden duty, be ye willing to do the same?" To the which all the people cried with a loud voice, and said "Yea, Yea, Yea;" and cried, "King Edward;" and prayed, "God save King Edward." And so to the south side in like manner, and to the east side, and to the west side.

After this his grace was borne again to the high altar in his chair, and there sat bareheaded: and all the nobles and peers of the realm were about his grace, and my lord of Canterbury principal; and there said certain prayers and godly psalms over his grace; and the choir answered with goodly singing, the organs playing, and trumpets blowing.

Then, after a certain unction, blessing, and singing of his grace, he was borne into a place by the high altar, where the kings use always to kneel at the elevation of the Parliament-mass. And there his grace was made ready of new garments; and after a certain space brought forth between two noblemen, and sat before the high altar bareheaded. Then after a while his grace was anointed in the breast, his soles of his feet, his elbows, his wrists of his hands, and his crown of his head, with virtuous prayer said by the bishop of Canterbury, and sung by the choir.

Then anon after this, a goodly fair cloth of red tinsel gold was holden over his head: and my lord of Canterbury, kneeling on his knees, and his grace lying prostrate afore the altar, anointed his back.

Then, after this, my lord of Canterbury arose and stood up, and the fair cloth taken away. Then my lord protector, duke of Somerset, held the crown in his hand a certain space; and immediately after began *Te Deum*, with the organs going, the choir singing, and the trumpets playing in the battlements of the church. Then, immediately after that, was the crown set on the king's majesty's head by them two [viz. Somerset, and the archbishop of Canterbury]. And after that another crown; and so his grace was crowned with three crowns.[1]

The relation breaks off here abruptly. But what is wanting may be supplied by the order of the coronation, as Bishop Burnet hath taken it out of the council-book, and given it us in his history.[2]

At this coronation there was no sermon, as I can find; but that was supplied by an excellent speech which was made by the archbishop. It was found among the inestimable collections of Archbishop Usher;[3] and though published of late years, yet I cannot but insert it here, tending so much to illustrate the memory of this great and good archbishop.

"Most dread and royal sovereign: the promises your highness hath made here, at your coronation, to forsake the devil and all his works, are not to be taken in the bishop of Rome's sense, when you commit anything distasteful to that see, to hit your majesty in the teeth, as Pope Paul the Third, late bishop of Rome, sent to your royal father, saying, 'Didst thou not promise, at our permission of thy coronation, to forsake the devil and all his works, and dost thou turn to heresy? For the breach of this thy promise, knowest thou not, that it is in our power to dispose of the sword and sceptre to whom we please?' We, your majesty's clergy, do humbly conceive that this promise reacheth not at your highness' sword, spiritual or temporal, or in the least at your highness' swaying the sceptre of this your dominion, as you and your predecessors have had them from God. Neither could your ancestors lawfully resign up their crowns to the bishop of Rome or to his legates, according to their ancient oaths then taken upon that ceremony.

---

[1] [The text has been here corrected from the Ecclesiastical History Society's edition, which was collated with the MS. in Corpus Christi (Benet) College, No. cv. 235—240. See vol. ii. pp. 3—6.]

[2] Hist. Ref. vol. ii. Collect. p. 93 [vol. ii. part ii. b. i. No. iv. p. 135].

[3] Foxes and Firebrands, part ii. [pp. 2—9. The original copy of this speech has never been met with. The text is corrected from the book, from which Strype quoted.]

"The bishops of Canterbury, for the most part, have crowned your predecessors, and anointed them kings of this land: yet it was not in their power to receive or reject them, neither did it give them authority to prescribe them conditions to take or to leave their crowns, although the bishops of Rome would encroach upon your predecessors by his bishop's act and oil, that in the end they might possess those bishops with an interest to dispose of their crowns at their pleasure. But the wiser sort will look to their claws and clip them.

"The solemn rites of coronation have their ends and utility; yet neither direct force or necessity: they be good admonitions to put kings in mind of their duty to God, but no increasement of their dignity: for they be God's anointed; not in respect of the oil which the bishop useth, but in consideration of their power, which is ordained; of the sword, which is authorized: of their persons, which are elected of God, and endued with the gifts of His Spirit, for the better ruling and guiding of His people.

"The oil, if added, is but a ceremony: if it be wanting, that king is yet a perfect monarch notwithstanding, and God's anointed, as well as if he was inoiled. Now for the person or bishop that doth anoint a king, it is proper to be done by the chiefest. But if they cannot, or will not, any bishop may perform this ceremony.

"To condition with monarchs upon these ceremonies, the bishop of Rome (or other bishops owning his supremacy) hath no authority: but he may faithfully declare what God requires at the hands of kings and rulers, that is, religion and virtue. Therefore not from the bishop of Rome, but as a messenger from my Saviour Jesus Christ, I shall most humbly admonish your royal majesty what things your highness is to perform.

"Your majesty is God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josias, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed; the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josias, who reformed the church of God in his days. You are to reward virtue, to revenge sin, to justify the innocent, to relieve the poor, to procure peace, to repress violence, and to execute justice throughout your realms. For precedents on those kings who performed not these things, the old law shows how the Lord revenged His quarrel; and on those kings who fulfilled these things He poured forth his blessings in abundance. For example, it is written of Josiah, in the book of the Kings, thus: 'Like unto him there was no king before him that turned to the Lord with all his heart, according to all the law of Moses; neither after him arose there any like him.'[1] This was to that prince a perpetual fame of dignity, to remain to the end of days.

"Being bound by my function to lay these things before your royal highness; the one as a reward, if you fulfil; the other as a judgment from God, if you neglect them: yet I openly declare, before the living God, and before these nobles of the land, that I have no commission to denounce your majesty deprived, if your highness miss in part, or in whole, of these performances: much less to draw up indentures between God and your majesty, or to say you forfeit your crown with a clause for the bishop of Rome, as have been done by your majesty's predecessors, King John, and his son Henry of this land. The Almighty God of His mercy let the light of His countenance shine upon your majesty, grant you a prosperous and happy reign, defend you, and save you: and let your subjects say, Amen.

"God save the king."

I find no bishop consecrated this year.

CHAPTER II.

A royal Visitation.

By these and other pious instigations of the archbishop, who was of high esteem with the king, he began early to think of the Church, and to take care about rectifying the disorders of its members. For about April there was a royal visitation resolved upon all England over, for the better reformation of religion. And accordingly, in the beginning of May, letters were issued out from the king to the archbishops, that they and all their fellow-bishops should forbear their visitations, as was usually done in all royal and archiepiscopal visitations. And it was enjoined, that no ministers should preach in any churches but in their own.

---

[1] [2 Kings xxiii. 25.]

In a volume in the Cotton library,[1] there be extant the king's letters to Robert [Holgate] archbishop of York, relating to this visitation; signed by our archbishop, the duke of Somerset the protector, and his brother Sir Thomas Seymour, the Lord Russel, favourers of the Reformation; the Lord St. Johns, Petre the secretary, who went along with it; Gage, controller of the household, and Baker, chancellor of the court of Augmentations, back-friends to it. I do not set down the letter itself, because the bishop of Sarum hath already published it in his history.[2]

Very worthy, sober, and learned men were appointed for visitors, both of the laity and clergy: and there was a book of injunctions prepared, whereby the king's visitors were to govern their visitation. The original of which book of injunctions is extant in Benet College library: there I have seen them, being signed by Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, the duke of Somerset, Sir Thomas Seymour, and divers others of the privy council; but no bishop, save Cranmer only; he being, I suppose, the only bishop then a privy counsellor; and now often appearing in the council for the better forwarding of religion. These injunctions are printed in Bishop Sparrow's Collection,[3] and briefly epitomized in the "History of the Reformation."[4]

The persons nominated for this present employment were these, as I find them set down in a manuscript formerly belonging to Archbishop Parker, but now in the Benet College library;[5] where you may observe the visitors were divided into six sets, and to each set were apportioned particular episcopal sees, and a preacher and a register, in this exact method following.

---

[1] Titus, b. ii. 89.

[2] Hist. Ref. vol. ii. Collect. p. 103 [vol. ii. part ii. b. i. No. 7, p. 149].

[3] Vol. ii. p. 28.

[4] [Vol. ii. p. 56.]

[5] [Vol. intit. Synodalia, MS. C.C.C.C. No. 121, fol. 448. The text is corrected here, as before (pp. 203—205), from the Ecclesiastical History Society's edition, p. 13.]

[Anno Dom. 1547.—Visitors in King Edward's time, anno primo, August.]

	Added by Archbishop Parker.	*Counties visited.*
Dean of Westminster.	Boston.	York.
Sir John Herseley, Kt.		Durysme.
Nicholas Ridley, preacher, [and bishop of Rochester].		Carlyll.
Edward Plankney, register.		Chester.
Sir Anthony Coke, Kt.		
Sir John Godsalve, Kt.[1]		Westminster.
Dr. Christopher Nevison.	The elder.	London.
John Gosnold.	A lawyer.	Norwich.
Dr. Madewe, preacher.		Ely.
Peter Lylly, register.		
Sir John Hales, Kt.		Rochester.
Sir John Mason, Kt.		
Sir Anthony Cope, Kt.		Canterbury.
Dr. Cave.	A lawyer.	Chichester.
Mr. Briggs, preacher.	Once of Pembroke.	
Rafe Morice, register.		Winchester.
Dean of Paul's.	Dr. May.	Sarisbury.
Dean of Exeter.	Dr. Hains.	Exeter.
Sir Walter Buckler, Kt.		Bath.
Mr. Cotisford, preacher.		Bristow.
John Redman, register.	Of Haslingfeld.	Glocester.
Dean of Lincoln.	Dr. Taylor.	Peterburgh.
Dr. Rowland Taylor.		Lincoln.
Mr. John Joseph [preacher].	Once of Canterbury, a friar.	Oxford.
		Coventry.
John Old, register.		Litchfeld.
Mr. Morison.	Once husband to the Earl of Rutland's wife.	Worcester.
Mr. Sydel [of Oxford].		Hereford.
Mr. Ferrer, preacher.	After lord bishop of St. David's.	Landaff.
		St. David's.
George Constantine, register.		Bangor.
Hue Rawlins, preacher in the Welch tongue.		St. Asse.

---

[1] He belonged to the office of the signet, and was prothonotary.

Where we may observe, that in every company of visitors was joined one preacher, or more; whose business, in the respective circuits, was to preach to the people, to dehort them from the superstitious use of beads and such-like things, and to learn them to worship God truly in heart and mind, and to obey the prince.

The method which these commissioners used in their visitation, as we collect from what was done at St. Paul's, London, was this. They summoned the bishop, and the members of each cathedral; and first sware them to renounce the bishop of Rome, and to the king's supremacy, and then, that they should present all things in their church and diocese needful to be reformed. Then certain interrogatories and articles of inquiry were read to them by the Register; to perform which, an oath was administered to them. After that, the printed injunctions, and others not printed, with the book of Homilies, were delivered, both to the bishop for his church, and the archdeacons for their respective archdeaconries; strictly enjoining them to see them speedily executed, reserving other new injunctions to be ministered afterwards, as they should see cause. Their next work was to examine the canons and priests, by virtue of their oaths which they had taken, concerning their lives and doctrines. What was discovered in other places concerning the vices of the clergy, we may conclude from what was found among the dignitaries of St. Paul's; for when the canons and priests belonging to this church were examined, one of them, named Painter, openly confessed that he had often carnally used a certain married man's wife, whom he would not name; and divers others, both of the canons and priests, confessed the same of themselves.[1]

*There be remaining, in the archives of the Church of Canterbury, the injunctions of the king's visitors to the dean and chapter there, bearing date September 22, an. 1° Edward VI. subscribed by the visitors' hands; which injunctions do all relate to the particular statutes of the Church, and are of no other moment.

There was now a book of Homilies prepared for present use, to be read in all churches, for the instruction of the people; and Erasmus' Paraphrase upon the New Testament,

[1] Fox [Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 743].

in English, was to be set up in all churches, for the better instruction of priests in the sense and knowledge of the Scriptures. And both these books, by the king's injunctions aforementioned,[1] were commanded to be taught and learned.

CHAPTER III.

Homilies, and Erasmus' Paraphrase.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER found it highly convenient to find out some means for the instruction of the people in true religion, till the Church could be better supplied with learned priests and ministers. For which purpose he resolved upon having some good homilies or sermons composed, to be read to the people; which should in a plain manner teach the grounds and foundation of true religion, and deliver the people from popular errors and superstitions. When this was going in hand with, the archbishop sent his letters to [Gardiner] the bishop of Winchester,[2] to try if he could bring him to be willing to join in this business; showing him, that it was no more than what was intended by the former king, and a Convocation in the year 1542, wherein himself was a member, to make such a stay of errors, as were then by ignorant preachers spread among the people. But this bishop was not for Cranmer's turn; in his answer signifying to him, "That since that Convocation the king his old master's mind changed, and that God had afterwards given him the gift of pacification" (as he worded it), meaning, that the king made a stop in his once intended Reformation. He added, "that there was a Convocation that extinguished those devices, and this was still in force; and therefore, that now nothing more ought to be done in church matters." And a copy of this letter he sent to the lord protector, trying to persuade him also to be of his mind.

---

[1] [See p. 208.]

[2] [Strype derived the whole of this narrative respecting Gardiner from Fox's Acts and Monuments, of which, in fact, it is an epitome.—Vol. vi. pp. 24–58, &c.]

The archbishop answered these letters of Winchester; wherein he again required these homilies to be made, by virtue of that Convocation five years before, and desired Winchester to weigh things. But he replied, "It was true, they communed then of such things, but they took not effect at that time; nor needed they to be put in execution now. And that in his judgment it could not be done without a new authority and command from the king's majesty." Then he used his politics, urging, "that it was not safe to make new stirs in religion: that the lord protector did well in putting out a proclamation to stop vain rumours; and he thought it not best to enterprise anything to tempt the people with occasion of tales, whereby to break the proclamation. And as in a natural body," he said, "rest without trouble did confirm and strengthen; so it was in a commonwealth, trouble travaileth, and bringeth things to looseness." Then he suggested the danger the archbishop might involve himself in by making alterations: "That he was not certain of his life (when the old order was broken, and a new brought in by homilies), that he should continue to see the new device executed; for it was not done in a day; he wished there were nothing else to do now. He suggested, that a new order engendered a new cause of punishment against them that offend; and punishments were not pleasant to them that have the execution; and yet they must be, for nothing may be contemned." There were two letters Winchester sent to the archbishop, in answer to as many from the archbishop; in which he laboured to persuade the archbishop not to innovate anything in religion during the king's minority; and particularly to forbear making homilies, and refusing for himself to meddle therein. An imperfect part of one of these letters I have laid in the Appendix,[1] as I transcribed it from the original.

So, when it was perceived that Winchester would not be brought to comply and join in with the archbishop and the rest, they went about the composing the homilies themselves. Cranmer had a great hand in them; and that homily of Salvation particularly seems to be of his own doing. This, while he was in composing it, was shown to Winchester by the archbishop, to which he made this objection:—"That he would yield to him in this homily, if they could show him any old writer that wrote how faith excluded charity in the office of justification, and said that it was against Scripture." Upon this Canterbury began to argue with him, and to show him how faith excluded charity in the point of justifying. And Winchester denied his arguments. And, in fine, such was his sophistication, that the archbishop at last told him, "He liked nothing, unless he did it himself: and that he disliked the homily for that reason, because he was not a counsellor."

---

[1] No. XXXV.

The council had now put this bishop in the Fleet for his refractoriness to the king's proceedings; where, if his complaint to the lord protector were true, he was somewhat straitly handled: for he was allowed no friend or servant, no chaplain, barber, tailor, nor physician: a sign he gave them high provocation. While he was here, the archbishop sent for him once or twice to discourse with him, and to try to bring him to comply with their proceedings in reforming religion. He dealt very gently with him, and told him, "That he was a man, in his opinion, meet to be called to the council again: but withal told him, that he stood too much in obstinacy; that it was perverse frowardness, and not any zeal for the truth:" and laboured to bring him to allow the book, which was now finished, and the Paraphrase of Erasmus.

The former he could not allow of, because of the doctrine therein by Cranmer asserted of justification by faith without works, which Cranmer took pains to persuade him about; telling him, his intent was hereby only to set out the freedom of God's mercy. But Winchester challenged him to show Scripture for it, or any one ancient writer, that faith in justifying excludeth charity. This Winchester afterward declared at large to the lord protector; and added, that the archbishop in that homily of Salvation had taken such a matter in hand, and so handled it, as, if he were his extreme enemy, he would have wished him to have taken that piece in hand, and so to have handled it as he did. He represented one of the archbishop's arguments for faith excluding charity to be thus, out of that homily: "We be justified by faith without all works of the law: charity is a work of the law:" *ergo*, "We are justified without charity."

But I warn the reader to consult the homily itself before he pass his judgment upon Cranmer's argument, as it is here represented by one that was none of his friend. In fine, he said, " There were as many faults in that homily of Salvation as he had been weeks in prison, and that was seven, besides the matter, viz. making a trouble without necessity.

In short, he charged the archbishop " for troubling the world with such a needless speculation as this is; because," he said, " that in baptism we are justified, being infants, before we can talk of the justification we strive for. For all men receive their justification in their infancy in baptism: and if they fall after baptism, they must arise again by the sacrament of penance. And so this doctrine," he said, " was to be sent to the universities; where it is meet to be talked and disputed of, and not fit for homilies." And, to disparage further the archbishop's judgment, he told the protector, " That if my lord of Canterbury would needs travail in this matter, he should never persuade that faith excluded charity in justification, unless he borrowed prisons of the protector; and then he might percase have some to agree to it: as poor men kneel at Rome when the bishop of Rome goeth by, or else are knocked on the head with a halberd." And then he made some scoffing mention of the strength of God's spirit in the archbishop, and his learning in his laws, so as to be able to overthrow with his breath all untruths, and establish truths. I make no reflection upon all this unseemly language of this bishop, but leave it to the reader to judge hereby of the learning and spirit that was in him. And could we have retrieved the archbishop's own arguments and replies to these barkings of Winchester, they would have left to the world a full vindication of Cranmer and his doctrine.

As to Erasmus' Paraphrase, the said bishop pretended, " He found divers things in it to condemn the work: and that he agreed with them that said, Erasmus laid the eggs, and Luther hatched them: and that of all the monstrous opinions that have risen, evil men had a wondrous occasion ministered to them from that book." He also wrote to the protector the particular objections he made against it. He said, " He might term it in one word *abomination*, both for the malice and untruth of much matter out of Erasmus' pen; and also for the arrogant ignorance of the translator of it: considering that book was authorized by the king, a charge was laid upon the realm of twenty thousand pounds, by enjoining every parish to buy one: whereof he had made an estimate by the probable number of buyers, and the price of the book. He charged the translator with ignorance, both in Latin and English; a man," he said, "far unmeet to meddle with such a matter, and not without malice on his part.

"Finally, the matter he had to show in both the books was in some part dangerous; and the concealment thereof a great fault, if he did not utter it. And that, he pretended, made him some while ago write to the council, declaring his mind in relation thereunto." For which he was sent to the Fleet.

The true occasion whereof, as I take it from his own letter, written with his own hand, which I have before me, was this. Upon the departure of the lord protector against the Scots, the king's visitors began their visitation.[1] "Then, as soon as the bishop heard of the visitation, and the books of Homilies and Injunctions were come to his hands, he wrote to the council, trusting, upon such earnest advertisements as he made, they would incontinently have sent for him; and, upon knowledge of so evident matter as he thought he had to show, would have staid till the protector's return. He saw," as he said, "a determination to do all things suddenly at one time. Whereunto though the protector had agreed, yet of his wisdom, as the bishop conjectured, he had rather these matters should have tarried till his return, had he not been *pressed on both sides* (an expression which the protector in a letter to him had used). He reckoned, that if he could have staid this matter in his absence, though by bringing himself into extreme danger, besides his duty to God and the king, he should have done the protector a pleasure, of whom he had this opinion, that willingly and wittingly he would neither break the act of Parliament, nor command books to be bought by authority, that contained such doctrine as those books did. Thus he had," he said, "remembrance of his grace in these his letters to the council; but he chiefly made not his grace, but God, his foundation, with the preservation of the late deceased king's honour, and the surety of the king then being. His writing, he confessed, was vehement; but he would have none offended with it, for he wrote it with a whole heart; and if he could have written it with the blood of his heart, he would have done it, to have staid the thing till it had been more maturely digested. He touched lively one point in his letter to the council, and considered whether the king might command against a common law, or an act of Parliament; and showed the danger of it in the late Lord Cardinal, and the Lord Tiptoft before him, who was executed [A.D. 1470] on Tower Hill for acting against the laws of the land, though it were by the king's commission; and by other precedents.

---

[1] Inter Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxvii. 84].

"Not long after these letters of the bishop to the council, they sent for him. When he came before them, he came furnished with his trinkets, his sleeves and bosom trussed full of books, to furnish his former allegations. He was heard very well, and gently. Then he showed matter that he thought would have moved them: for there he showed the two contrary books [meaning the Homilies, and Erasmus' Paraphrase]. But the council told him they were not moved, and added, that their consciences agreed not with his; using many good words to bring him to conformity. After he had been aside from them, and was returned again, they entered a precise order with him, either to receive the Injunctions, or to refuse. In which case, they told him, that the protector was privy to what was done there. The bishop answered, that he would receive them as far as God's law and the king's would bind him. And because he saw they drew to such preciseness, he told them, there were three weeks of delay to the coming of the visitors to him. In the mean time he offered to go to Oxford, to abide the discussion there. That offer was not allowed. He desired to go to his house at London, and have learned man speak with him there. That was not accepted. He entered then the allegation of the Gospel, of the servant that said he would not do a thing, and yet did it: and so, the bishop said, it might be, that although he then said nay, as his conscience served him, yet he might change, and was a man that might be tempted. But as his conscience was then, he thought that God's laws and the king's letted him. Then they asked him, if he had spoken to any man of what he found in the books. To which he answered truly, [acknowledging he had]; but told the lords, that he thought it hard, unless there were a greater matter than this, to send him to prison for declaring his mind beforehand, what he minded to do, before it had been by him done; who had all the mean time to repent himself."

In the end, the council committed him to the Fleet. Of his behaviour under this censure, he hath these words:—"That he had well digested it; and so all might be well, he cared not what became of his body. That he departed as quietly from them as ever man did, and had endured with as little grudge. He had learned this lesson in the world, never to look backward, as St. Paul saith, 'nor remember that is past.' That he would never grudge or complain of anything for himself."

To the lord protector, to whom he wrote all this account of himself, turning his discourse, he said, "That he thought it very weighty to have these books recommended to the realm in the king's name, by his (the protector's) direction, since the king himself knew nothing of them, and therefore nothing could be ascribed to him: and his grace had been so occupied, as all men knew, that he had no leisure to peruse them. And yet of such sort were the books, according to the account he had before written; and that if no man had advertised the council, as he had, it was because they had not read them as he had done."

In vindication of the learned author of the Paraphrase, so bedashed by Winchester, I will here use the words of him that writ the Epistle Dedicatory before the translated [the] Paraphrase on the Acts. "I cannot but judge, that whoso are prompt and hasty condemners of Erasmus, or eager adversaries unto his doctrine, do, under the name and colour of Erasmus, rather utter their stomach and hatred against God's word, and the grace of the Gospel, which Erasmus for his part most diligently and most simply laboureth to bring to light." And to such as said that his doctrine was scarcely sincere, and that he did somewhat err, he answered, "That Erasmus, forasmuch as he was a man, and so esteemed himself, would that his works should none otherwise be read or accepted than the writings of other mortal men. And that, after his judgment, a little trip among so many notable good works for the interpretation of Scripture, and for the help of the simple, should rather be borne withal, than so many good things to be either rejected or kept away from the hungry Christian reader. It is a cold charity that can bear with nothing; and an eager malice it is, that for a trifle, or a matter of nothing, would have the ignorant to lack so much good edifying, as may be taken of Erasmus."

Mention was made a little above of the bishop of Winchester's objections against the Paraphrase of Erasmus, sent by him in a letter to the lord protector. This paper I have met with in Sir John Cotton's library; and being somewhat long, I have put it into the Appendix:[1] wherein may be seen at large the bishop's quarrels, both against the Paraphrase and the Homilies; labouring here to show, that the book of Homilies and Erasmus' Paraphrase did contradict each other, and therefore could not both be received; and that there were errors in each, and so neither ought to be admitted. Moreover, he urged the danger of making alterations in religion contrary to the laws then in force; designing thereby, if he could over-persuade the protector, to enervate the king's late injunctions; for the Papists, whose chief instrument was Winchester, saw it was time now to bestir themselves to overthrow these proceedings that were in hand, if it were possible.

When this affair happened between the council and the bishop, for which they cast him into the Fleet, Somerset the protector was absent in an expedition against the Scots: by whose conduct, in the month of September, God blessed the king with a very glorious victory, in a battle fought near Musselburgh [Sept. 10]. Which redounded much to the protector's honour, wherein was more danger than he looked for, which gave him the greater occasion to show his valour: for there were but few lost on the English side; but fifteen thousand Scots reckoned to be slain, and two thousand taken prisoners. For this victory a public thanksgiving was thought fit to be celebrated. And the archbishop required of [Bonner] the bishop of London, to preach a sermon at St. Paul's, before the mayor and aldermen, and immediately after a procession in English, and *Te Deum.* The archbishop's letter (which will show what the court thought of that good success) was as followeth :[1]—

---

[1] No. XXXVI.

"After our right hearty commendations: whereas it hath pleased Almighty God to send the king's majesty such victory against the Scots, as was almost above the expectation of man, and such as hath not been heard of in any part of Christendom this many years: in which victory above the number of 15,000 Scots be slain, 2,000 taken prisoners; and among them many noblemen, and others of good reputation; all their ordnance and baggage of their camp also won from them: the king's majesty, with advice of his highness' privy council, presently attending upon his majesty's most royal person, well knowing this, as all other goodness, to be gifts of God, hath and so doth account it; and therefore rendereth unto Him the only glory and praise for the same: and so hath willed me, not only in his majesty's cathedral church, and other churches of my diocese, to give thanks to Almighty God, but also to require, in his name, all other bishops in the province of Canterbury to do, or cause to be done, semblably in their cures. Which his majesty's pleasure I have thought good to signify unto you: requiring you, not only to cause a sermon to be made in your cathedral church the next holy-day after receipt hereof, declaring the goodness of God, and exhorting the people to faith and amendment of life; and to give thanks to God for this victory; but also at the same time, immediately after the sermon, and in presence of the mayor, aldermen, and other the citizens of [the city of] London, to cause the procession in English, and *Te Deum*, to be openly and devoutly sung. And that you do also cause the like order to be given in every parish church in your diocese, upon some holy-day, when the parishioners shall be there present, with as much speed as you may; not failing, as you tender his majesty's pleasure. Thus fare you heartily well. From Oatlands, the 18th day of December,[1] the year of our Lord God 1547.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [55].

"Your loving friend,
"THO. CANTUARIEN.

"The council's pleasure is, you shall see this executed on Tuesday next. [To the dean and chapter of] St. Paul's in London. This be given in haste."

CHAPTER IV.

A Convocation.

THE Parliament now sat, and a Convocation was held November 5th. Some account of what was done here I will in this place set down, as I extracted it out of the notes of some member, as I conceive, then present at it.[2]

Session I. November 5.

"John Taylor, dean of Lincoln, chosen prolocutor by universal consent."

Session II. November 18.

"This day the prolocutor was presented to the archbishop and bishops in the upper house."

Session III. November 22.

"It was then agreed, that the prolocutor, in the name of the whole house, should carry some petitions unto the most reverend father in God the archbishop, viz.:—

"I. That provision be made, that the ecclesiastical law may be examined, and promulged, according to that statute of Parliament in the 35th year of Henry VIII.

"II. That, for certain urgent causes, the Convocation of the clergy may be taken and chosen into the lower house of Parliament, as anciently it was wont to be.

---

[1] It should be September, I suppose.

[2] C.C.C.C. Library. Vol. intit. Synodalia [No. 121, fol. 5, a. See Ecclesiastical History, Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 36].

"III. That the works of the bishops and others, who, by the command of the Convocation, have laboured in examining, reforming, and publishing the divine service, may be produced, and laid before the examination of this house.

"IV. That the rigour of the statute of paying the king the first-fruits may be somewhat moderated in certain urgent clauses, and may be reformed if possible."

The fourth session is omitted in the manuscript, the writer probably being then absent.

Session V. November ult.

"This day Mr. Prolocutor exhibited, and caused to be read publicly, a form of a certain ordinance, delivered by the most reverend the archbishop of Canterbury, for the receiving of the body of our Lord under both kinds, viz. of bread and wine. To which he himself subscribed, and some others, viz. Mr. Prolocutor; Mr. Cranmer, archdeacon of Canterbury; Mr. May, Mr. Jenyngs, Mr. Williams, Wilson, Carleton, &c."

Session VI. December 2.

"This session, all this whole session, in number sixty-four, by their mouths did approve the proposition made the last session, of taking the Lord's body in both kinds, *nullo reclamante.*

"The same day with consent were chosen Mr. Dr. Draycot, Bellasis, Dakyns, Jeffrey, Elize ap Rice, Oking, Pool, and Ap Harry, to draw up a form of a statute for paying tithes in cities, &c."

This was a thing the clergy now were very intent upon. For I find in the archbishop's reformation of the ecclesiastical laws, there is a law made for paying tithes in cities, as was done in London.

Session VII. December 9.

"By common consent were nominated and assigned Mr. Rowland Merick, John ap Harry, John Williams, and Elizeus Price, DD.LL. to obtain the following effects, viz. That the petition made to have this house adjoined to the lower house of Parliament, may be granted. *Item,* That a mitigation of the sore penalty expressed in the statutes against the recusants, for nonpayment of the perpetual tenths, may be also obtained.

"And the same day were likewise appointed, Mr. [Kingsmill] Dean of Winchester, and Mr. Dr. Draycot, to accompany Mr. Prolocutor to my lord of Canterbury, to know a determinate answer, what indemnity and impunity this house shall have to treat of matters of religion, in cases forbidden by the statutes of this realm to treat in."

Session VIII. December 17.

"This day was exhibited a certain proposition under these words, viz. That all such canons, laws, statutes, decrees, usages, and customs, heretofore made, had, or used, that forbid any person to contract matrimony, or condemn matrimony already contracted by any person, for any vow or promise of priesthood, chastity, or widowhood, shall from henceforth cease, be utterly void, and of none effect. To which proposition many subscribed, partly in the affirmative, partly in the negative."

In the affirmative,	In the negative,
53 voices.	22 voices.

And here I will insert a few words, which I take out of a book writ very near this time, and by one who was well acquainted with the affairs of this Convocation. "The affirmants," saith he, "of this proposition were almost treble so many as were the negants. Amongst which affirmants divers were then unmarried, and never afterwards did take the liberty of marriage; as Dr. Taylor the bishop, Dr. Benson, Dr. Redman, Dr. Hugh Weston, Mr. Wotton, &c. Of them that denied it, notwithstanding their subscriptions to the contrary, as few as they were, yet some of them took upon them the liberty of marriage not long after; as Dr. Oken, Mr. Rayner, Mr. Wilson, &c."[1]

This subscription following was made by the hand of John Redman, S.T.P. in this very Convocation, who, being absent this session (for his name is not among the 53), was desired to declare his own sense in this point under his own hand, being so learned a man, and in such great credit universally for his ability in deciding questions of conscience.

---

[1] Defence of Priests' Marriage, p. 268.—[See p. 76.]

"I think that although the word of God do exhort and counsel priests to live in chastity, out of the cumber of the flesh and the world, that thereby they may the more wholly attend to their calling; yet the band of containing from marriage doth only lie upon priests of this realm by reason of canons and constitutions of the Church, and not by any precept of God's word; as in that they should be bound by reason of any vow, which, in as far as my conscience is, priests in this Church of England do not make. I think that it standeth well with God's word, that a man which hath been, or is but once married, being otherwise accordingly qualified, may be made a priest. And I think that forasmuch as canons and rules made in this behalf be neither universal nor everlasting, but upon consideration may be altered and changed, therefore the king's majesty, and the higher powers of the Church, may, upon such reasons as shall move them, take away the clog of perpetual continency from the priests, and grant that it may be lawful to such as cannot, or will not, contain, to marry one wife. And if she die, then the said priest to marry no more, remaining still in his ministration."

Some larger account of this memorable Convocation, especially as to some of these matters then under their hands, may be read in Bishop Stillingfleet's "Irenicum,"[1] published by him from a manuscript volume once belonging to Archbishop Cranmer.

In this Convocation the archbishop bore the great sway; and what things were agitated herein were chiefly by his motion and direction; some whereof were turned into laws by the Parliament, that was now sitting, through his activeness and influence. As particularly that repeal of the statute of the Six Articles, and of some other severe laws, decreeing divers things treason and felony, made in the former king's reign. For when the archbishop in the Convocation had made a speech to the clergy, exhorting them to give themselves to the study of the Scriptures, and to consider what things in the Church needed reformation, that so the Church might be discharged of all popish trash, not yet thrown out; some told him, that, as long as the Six Articles remained, it was not safe for them to deliver their opinions. This he reported to the council; upon which they ordered this act of repeal.[1]

---

[1] Irenic. p. 387.

By his means also another great thing, moved in the Convocation, was now ratified, and made a law by this Parliament; which was, for the administration of the communion under both kinds throughout the kingdom of England and Ireland.[2] And upon this the king appointed certain grave and learned bishops, and others, to assemble at Windsor Castle, there to treat and confer together; and to conclude upon and set forth one perfect and uniform order of communion, according to the rules of Scripture, and the use of the primitive church. And this being framed, it was enjoined to be used throughout the realm by a proclamation, and all required to receive it with due reverence.

I meet with a writing of the archbishop, without date, consisting of queries concerning the mass, in order to the abolishing it, and changing it into a communion. Which I know not where so well to place as here, now the Convocation was employed upon this matter: for it seems to have been drawn up by the archbishop on purpose to be laid before the consideration of this house. The queries were these:—

"What or wherein John's fasting, giving alms, being baptized, or receiving the sacrament of the altar in England, doth profit and avail Thomas, dwelling in Italy, and not knowing what John in England doth?

"Whether [the said acts in John do] profit them that be in heaven, and wherein?

"Whether it lieth in the [said John[3]] to defraud any member of Christ's body of the benefit of his fasting, almsdeeds, baptism, or receiving of the sacrament, and to apply the same benefit to one person more than to another.

"What thing is the presentation of the body and blood of Christ in the mass, which you call the oblation and sacrifice of Christ? And wherein standeth it, in act, gesture, or word; and in what act, gesture, or words?

---

[1] Hist. Ref. vol. i. p. 40 [vol. ii. p. 83].

[2] [Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v. pp. 715, 716.]

[3] [Strype has here interpolated the words, "faster, giver of alms, receiver of the sacrament, him that is baptized.]

"Is there any rite or prayer, not expressed in the Scripture, which Christ used or commanded at the first institution of the mass, which we be now bound to use; and what the same be?

"Whether in the primitive Church there were any priests that lived by saying of mass, matins, and even-song, and praying for souls only? And whether any such state of priesthood be allowed in the Scriptures, or be meet to be allowed now?

"For what cause it were not expedient nor convenient to have the whole mass in English?

"Wherein consisteth the mass by Christ's institution?

"What time the accustomed order began first in the Church, that the priest alone should receive the sacrament?

"Whether it be convenient that the same custom continue still within this realm?

"Whether it be convenient that masses satisfactory should continue; that is to say, priests hired to sing for souls departed?

"Whether the Gospel ought to be taught at the time of the mass to the understanding of the people being present?

"Whether in the mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand?"[1]

To proceed to some other things wherein our archbishop was this year concerned. In June [19] the church of St. Paul's was hanged with black, and a sumptuous hearse set up in the choir, and a *Dirige* there sung for the French king, who deceased the [22nd] March precedent. And on the next day the archbishop, assisted with eight bishops more, all in rich mitres, and their other pontificals, did sing a mass of requiem; and the bishop of Rochester[2] preached a funeral sermon.[3]

---

[1] [The text has been corrected from the Parker Society's edition of the Works of Abp. Cranmer, vol. ii. pp. 150—153, where the documents are quoted from "Stillingfleet MSS." Lambeth Libr. 1108, fol. 6 and 40.]

[2] [Ridley, who was afterwards bishop of Rochester, preached this sermon. Holbeach was at that time bishop, and had not been translated to Lincoln, of which see he was afterwards diocesan.]

[3] Stow['s Chronicle, p. 594].

A nice matter was now put by the council to the archbishop, having some other bishops and learned men joined with him, to the number of ten. The case was, "Whether a man divorced from his wife for her adultery might not lawfully marry again?" This was propounded upon the account of a great man in those times, namely, the brother of Queen Katherine Par, marquis of Northampton; who had gotten a divorce from his wife, the daughter of Bourchier, earl of Essex, for adultery. The canon law would not allow marrying again upon a divorce, making divorce to be only a separation from bed and board, and not a dissolving the knot of marriage. This was a great question depending among the civilians; and it being committed to the determination of our archbishop, and some other delegates (though the marquis stayed not for their resolution, but in this interval married Elizabeth, daughter of the Lord Brook), he searched so diligently into the Scriptures first, and then into the opinions of fathers and doctors, that his collections swelled into a volume, yet remaining in the hands of a learned bishop of this realm; the sum whereof is digested by the bishop of Sarum.[1] Cranmer seemed to allow of marriage in the innocent person.

He was a means also to the council of forbidding processions; wherein the people carried candles on Candlemas-day, ashes on Ash-Wednesday, palms on Palm-Sunday; because he saw they were used so much to superstition, and looked like festivals to the heathen gods. So that this year on Candlemas-day, the old custom of bearing candles in the church, and, on Ash-Wednesday following, giving ashes in the church, was left off through the whole city of London.[2]

He was a member of a committee this winter, appointed to examine all the offices of the Church, and to consider where they needed reformation, and accordingly to reform them. Of this commission were most of the bishops, and several others of the most learned divines in the nation. And a new office for the communion was by them prepared, and by authority set forth, as was observed before;[3] and received all over England.

[1] Bishop Wigorn, Hist. Ref. vol. ii. p. 56 [vol. ii. pp. 115—120].

[2] Stow['s Chronicle, p. 595].

[3] [See p. 224.]

CHAPTER V.

The Archbishop's Catechism.

This year the archbishop put forth a very useful catechism, intituled, "A short Instruction to Christian Religion, for the singular Profit of Children and young People." This catechism went not by way of question and answer, but contained an easy exposition of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the two Sacraments. The first and second Commandments were put together as one, and the whole recital of the second omitted, according to the use in those times; but that Commandment is explained under the first. The substance of this book is grave, serious, and sound doctrine. It is said in the title-page "to be overseen and corrected by the archbishop." Indeed it was a catechism wrote originally in the German language, for the use of the younger sort in Nuremberg; translated into Latin by Justus Jonas, junior, who now was entertained by the archbishop in his family, and thence turned into our vulgar tongue by the said archbishop, or his special order. But it is certain, so great a hand he had therein, that in the archbishop's first book of the Sacrament, he said, that it was "translated by himself, and set forth." Bishop Gardiner, in his book against the archbishop, takes advantage of two things in this catechism against him, as though he himself, when he put it forth, was of the opinion of the corporal presence. The one was a picture that stood before the book, where was an altar with candles lighted, and the priest apparelled after the old sort, putting the wafer into the communicant's mouth. The other is an expression or two used somewhere in the book, "that with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ:" and, "that in the sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ:" and, "this we must believe, if we will be counted Christian men." But to both Cranmer, in his next book against Gardiner, made answer, "That as for the picture, it was that was set before the Dutch edition of the book, and so none of his doing; but that he afterwards caused the Popish picture to be altered into a picture representing Christ eating his last supper with his disciples. As for the expressions," he said, "he taught, that we in the sacrament do receive the body and blood of Christ spiritually; and, that the words *really* and *substantially* were not used, but *truly*." And in his answer to Dr. Richard Smith's preface,[1] wrote against the said archbishop, who it seems had twitted him also with this catechism, he spake largely of these his expressions in his own vindication.

There was another book of the archbishop's against Unwritten Verities, which I do by conjecture place here, as put forth under this year, or near this time; which I suppose Dr. Smith nibbled at in his book of Traditions, which this year he recanted. The book was in Latin, and consisted only of allegations out of the Bible and ancient writers. In Queen Mary's days the book was again published by an English exile, naming himself E. P. The title it now bore was, "A Confutation of Unwritten Verities, by divers Authorities, diligently and truly gathered out of the Holy Scripture and Ancient Fathers; by Tho. Cranmer, late archbishop, and burned at Oxford for the Defence of the true Doctrine of our Saviour. Translated and set forth by E. P."[2] Before it is a preface of the translator to his countrymen and brethren in England. In it he lamented the woeful state of things in England, by the restoring of Popery, and the persecution of Protestants there; and showed what a kind of man the chief bishop then in England, viz. Cardinal Pole, was, who in the last king's reign went from prince to prince, to excite them to make war against his own prince and country.

This treatise is but a bare collection of places of Holy Scripture, and ancient fathers, to prove, "That the canon of the Bible is a true, and sound, and perfect doctrine, containing all things necessary to salvation: that neither the writing of the old fathers, without the word of God, nor general councils, nor the oracles of angels, nor apparitions from the dead, nor customs, can be sufficient in religion to establish doctrine, or maintain new articles of faith." Then reasons are given against unwritten verities, and the places of Holy Scripture, and other writers, which the Papists bring to maintain unwritten verities, are answered. At last the objections of the Papists are confuted, in a concluding chapter. Which last part was not writ by the archbishop, but by the translator. For relating here the story of the holy maid of Kent, he saith, she was examined by Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury.[1] And at last he saith,

---

[1] [This answer is printed in vol. ii. p. 368, of the Parker Society's edition of Archbishop Cranmer's Works.]

[2] [The Confutation of Unwritten Verities will also be found in the same edition, vol. ii. p. 9, *et seq.*]

---

[1] ["But Elizabeth Barton, called the holy maid of Courtop Street in Kent, passed all others in devilish devices. For she could, when she list, feign herself to be in a trance, disfigure her face, draw her mouth awry toward the one ear, feigning that she was thus tormented of Satan for the sins of the people, and delivered from his power by our blessed lady of Courtop Street, and by her led into heaven, hell, and purgatory, and there saw all the joys and pains of those places; and took upon her to prophesy of things to come, and of the king's death. This instrument of the devil drew into her confederacy, both of heresy and treason, holy monks of the Charter House, obstinate (they would be called observant) friars of Greenwich, nice nuns of Sion, black monks (both of cowls and conditions) of Christ Church and St. Austin's of Canterbury, knights, squires, learned men, priests, and many other: of which sort (whether they were blinded by her, or else of their own mere malice and hypocrisy dissembled the matter) some, by due proof made against them, were justly condemned both of heresy and treason, and suffered with the said Elizabeth Barton, according to their demerits; and some, acknowledging their own offences, were delivered by the king's pardon. This wicked woman caused a letter to be made by a monk of St. Austin's of Canterbury, in golden letters, feigning the same to be delivered to her by an angel from heaven. This monster was convented both before William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Wolsey, cardinal and archbishop of York: who, either because that generation of the clergy hath alway defended idolatry and superstition, or because she knew too much of their incontinency and other wickedness of living (for she threatened them with eternal damnation, except they repented and amended their lives), they clearly discharged her without finding of any fault in her at all. But when the matter came to be examined by Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Cromwell, then master of the rolls, they so handled the matter, that they found out the whole nest of that conspiracy; wherein was disclosed the whole number of those confederates, their books of heresy and treason, the authors and writers of the same, and of the letter feigned to be sent from heaven. All whose detestable facts, as well of idolatry, heresy, and also of treason, were so wittily and learnedly by God's word convinced at Canterbury by Dr. Heath, now chancellor of England (she being present and openly confessing the

"I have plainly, fully, and truly, without fraud of cloaking, or colour of rhetoric and dark speech, to blind the eyes of the simple people, answered to all that I remember which the Papists do, or can allege, either by writing, preaching, or reasoning, for the defence of their unwritten verities; whereupon they build so many detestable idolatries and heresies. And yet I will not be so much wedded to mine own wit or will, but that, if they be able to answer so plainly and truly to the Scriptures, authors, and reasons rehearsed by me, as I have done to theirs, and to prove their doctrine of unwritten verities by as plain consent both of Scriptures, ancient doctors, and as pithy arguments as I have done mine and set it forth in print to the judgment of the whole world as mine is; I shall not only acknowledge mine ignorance and error, but I shall gladly return into England, recant my heresies, &c."[1] Hence it is plain, that the conclusion of the book, as well as the preface, was writ by the translator.

I will add one passage taken out of this book, about the middle, whereby it may be seen what a clergy was now in England. Having quoted the canons of the Apostles, "Let not a bishop or deacon put away his wife,"[2] &c., he makes a heavy complaint against the frequent practice of beastly sins in the priests, adultery, &c., and that they never were punished. "And [with]in my memory," as he proceeds,

same), and also by another learned man at Paul's Cross, [Salcot, bishop of Bangor], that the most part of them, which were before by her seduced, did then utterly abhor her shameless and abominable facts."—A Confutation of Unwritten Verities. Parker Society's edition of Abp. Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. pp. 65, 66.]

[1] [The text has been corrected from the Unwritten Verities; it stood thus in the original:—"I have plainly and fully answered to all that I remember, the Papists do, or can allege, by writing, preaching, or reasoning, for the defence of their unwritten verities, on which they build so many detestable idolatries and heresies. But yet, if any be able to answer so plainly and truly to the Scriptures, authorities, and reasons rehearsed by me as I have done to theirs, and to prove their doctrines of unwritten verities by as plain testimonies and reasons as I have done mine, I shall not only acknowledge mine ignorance and error, but I shall gladly return into England, recant mine heresies, &c."]

[2] *'Επίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσϐύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μὴ ἐκϐαλλέτω προφάσει εὐλαϐείας· ἐὰν δὲ ἐκϐάλλῃ, ἀφοριζέσθω· ἐπιμένων δὲ, καθαιρείσθω.*—Can. Apost. can. 3.

"which is above thirty years, and also by the information of other, that be twenty years elder than I, I could never [perceive or] learn that [any] one priest [under the pope's kingdom] was [ever] punished [for advoutry by his ordinary]." [1]

This is some account of the care he took for the Church in general as metropolitan. But he had a particular care of his own diocese, now his power was not checked, as it was in the former reign, especially of the city of Canterbury, which had been formerly the backwardest in religion of any other place of his diocese. He supplied this city with store of excellent learned preachers,—Turner, the two Ridleys, Becon, Besely, and John Joseph, who this year went along with the king's visitors, as one of their preachers.[2] These converted not a few to sincere religion; as may appear by those numbers of Canterbury that in Queen Mary's reign suffered the torment of fire for their profession of the Gospel. But in that reign all the preachers fled, so that there was scarce one remaining in the city, which was looked upon as a particular sign of God's displeasure against that place, because the professors there, and others, reformed not themselves according to those opportunities of grace which God had put into their hands. And so I find in a letter to them, wrote by some eminent person in prison in Queen Mary's reign:—"Alas! how few faithful servants hath the Lord of life in these troublesome days within Canterbury, to whom above all other people, in comparison of multitude, he hath sent most plenteously His word, in the mouths of most excellent preachers. But even as the people were negligent, hard-hearted, nothing willing to take the lively word unto their defence against the world, the devil, and the flesh—even so hath He permitted the same preachers to be dispersed, that not one of them should be a comfortable example to such an unkind people."[3]

---

[1] [See Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 38.]

[2] [See above, p. 209.]

[3] Fox's MSS.

CHAPTER VI.

The Archbishop's Care of the University.

The archbishop was a great patron of all solid learning, being a very learned man himself. And knowing very well how much the *libertas philosophandi*, and the knowledge of tongues, and the other parts of human learning, tended to the preparing men's minds for the reception of true religion, and for the detecting of the gross errors and frauds of Popery, which could subsist only in the thick darkness of ignorance; these things made him always cast a favourable aspect upon the universities, and especially that of Cambridge, whereof he himself was once a member, which the governors, and the rest of the gremials, very well knew, and therefore did frequently apply to him, as often as they had need of the favour of the court or Parliament. Roger Ascham, Fellow of St. John's College, and one of the floridest wits of this university, and who succeeded Sir John Cheke in reading the Greek lecture, said of him in a letter he sent him (wherein he styled him *Literarum decus et ornamentum*), "That he was the man, who was accustomed to express great joy at the good progress of learning, such was his singular goodwill towards it; and when it went otherwise than well with it, he alone could apply a remedy; such was his sway and authority." And so much was he the known Mecænas of learning, that according to the public encouragement or prejudice it received, so the vulgar accounted the praise or dispraise thereof to redound upon Cranmer. So that if learning were discountenanced, it was esteemed to cast some disparagement upon him; if it flourished, it was a sign that Cranmer prevailed at court. For to that purpose do those words of the said Ascham to the archbishop, in another letter seem to tend:—"Nulla hoc tempore literis vel insperata clades, vel expectata commoditas accidere potest, cujus tu non aut author, ad magnam commendationem, aut particeps ad aliquam reprehensionem, voce ac sermone omnium jactatus eris."

In this year 1547, and in the month of October, there fell out an accident in St. John's College in Cambridge, which made those of that college that favoured learning and religion (as that house was the chief nursery thereof in that university) judge it highly necessary to apply themselves to the archbishop, to divert a storm from them. The case was this: a French lad of this college, sizer to one Mr. Stafford there, had one night, in hatred to the mass, secretly cut the string whereby the pix hung above the altar in the chapel. The like to which was indeed done in other places of the nation by some zealous persons, who began this year, without any warrant, to pull down crucifixes and images out of the churches: as was particularly done in St. Martin's, Ironmonger-lane, London. This affront to the Popish service made a great noise in the college; and the sober party among them feared the ill effect it might have upon the whole college, either to its disparagement or prejudice, when the news of it should come to court; especially by the means of such who stomached much the decay and downfal of superstition, and endeavoured what in them lay to obscure and eclipse the rising light of the Gospel. Therefore, after the matter had been taken into examination by themselves, quietly and without tumult, they thought fit, by consent, to acquaint the archbishop with it in a letter; which one of their members, Thomas Lever, a learned and grave man, carried; who likewise should inform him of all circumstances: and so committed both the cause and person to his grace's judgment and censure. But withal letting him know, that the youth was well learned, and before this had carried himself quietly and modestly; and that Mr. Stafford, who was a great student, could not tell how to be without him: but however, such was his prudence, that he was willing to leave his scholar and his fault to the archbishop's discretion. By which message they warily avoided the odium of this action, as though they had countenanced any violent or illegal methods for the removal of superstition, before it were done by public authority; and likewise rescued their scholar from expulsion, or too rigorous punishment, which some in the college would have been apt to inflict upon him, had not the matter been thus prudently removed from them.

Let me here insert another matter that happened the year after in the same college; whereat divers took occasion so to represent it to our archbishop, as to create in him, as much as they could, an ill opinion of the better sort of the members thereof. About November or December, in the year 1548, some of the college got this question to be disputed in the chapel concerning the mass, "Ipsane cœna dominica fuerit, necne?" It was handled with great learning by two learned fellows of the house,—Thomas Lever and Roger Hutchinson. The noise of this soon spread in the university; and many were much displeased at it. At last Ascham, being a very fit person to undertake it, was prevailed with by the rest to bring this question out of the private walls of the college, into the public schools: yet, as was pretended, with this mind and meaning, not dogmatically to assert anything, but modestly and freely to learn from learned men what could be fetched out of the Holy Scriptures to defend the mass, which had taken up, not only the chiefest place in religion, and men's consciences, but took away in effect all the use and benefit of the faithful ministry of the word and sacraments from Christians. This business they set about with quietness; they conferred their common studies together, propounded to themselves the canonical Scriptures, by the authority whereof they wished the whole might be decided: they took also along with them, concerning this matter, the ancient canons of the early Church, the councils of fathers, the decrees of popes, the judgments of doctors, the great plenty of questionists, all the modern authors, both German and Roman. But this design of theirs was not only the subject of talk in the university, but noted in the public sermons: and such labour there was among some in opposition to it, that Dr. Madew, then vice-chancellor, was prevailed with by his letters to forbid the disputation. They obeyed, but took it hardly that they might not as well dispute in favour of the question, as others might preach as much as they would against it. But it ended not here; for their adversaries industriously carried the report hereof to our prelate, and did so blacken the business by their slanders, and loud and tragical clamours, that he became somewhat offended with the undertakers. These on the other hand, no question, applied themselves to him with their just defence: and not only to him, but to others, and particularly to Mr. Cecil, one formerly their colleague, who was now master of requests to the protector, letting him know the whole matter; that he might upon occasion represent the cause the more favourably to the archbishop. And Ascham himself was their scribe; whose epistle, penned in a handsome Latin style, being not extant among his printed epistles, and being subservient to the history of the university in those times, I have thought worthy to be inserted among the originals.[1] In this letter he charged the other party as well with malice as ignorance: for this their question was very agreeable to Thomas Aquinas, who proved that the mass exceeded the Lord's supper in many prerogatives, and much differed from it by many notes; as, women, children, bastards, maimed persons, were not allowed to partake of the mass, but they were received to the holy supper. So that should any say (as he proceeds in his letter), that the mass and the supper were the same, they might exclaim against them much more. Their adversaries had charged them with being too rash, in not staying for what reformation the state should make: but he said, that all Cambridge wanted rather spurs to put them forward, than a bridle to keep them back. But though their dispute were prohibited, yet their studies upon the same argument had in a manner increased; having now written a just treatise of the mass, which they intended shortly to present to the protector; and waited only for Cecil's and Cheke's advice therein. But I must beg pardon of the reader for this excursion.

And as I have given an instance or two of the private address of a particular college to him in a particular case, so I will subjoin another more public of the university in general. In the year abovesaid, being the first year of the king, the university laboured under the fears of the encroachments of the town upon their privileges, and likewise under great suspicions of being spoiled of its revenues, or at least of having them much diminished; she having observed how those of her sister, the Church, were daily invaded by secular hands. These fears put Cambridge now in a decaying state, and the studies of good literature began to be but little minded. Add also hereunto, that ecclesiastical preferments, which formerly were the peculiar rewards of academics, were now ordinarily enjoyed by mere unlearned laymen. So the earl of Hartford held a deanery, a treasureship of a cathedral church, and four of the best prebends; and his son three hundred pounds a year out of a bishopric.[1] And learned men were seldom taken notice of, or had honours conferred on them; and if they obtained any rewards, they were but small. Nor were scholars now in any repute or value: so that neither poor nor rich abode long at their studies in the university, to attain to any considerable degrees of learning. The poor could not, because the encouragements there were scarce capable to maintain them; and the richer sort would not, choosing rather to follow some other course, because of the obscure and neglected condition learning then lay under. The grammar schools also became disused, parents choosing any other calling for their children, rather than to bring them up to letters: as Roger Ascham, a man that well knew the state of the university, complains in a letter to the marquis of Northampton. This was the cause that the said Ascham pensively thus writ unto our archbishop not long after:—"That the university was then in so depressed and drooping a condition, that very few had hope of coming thither at all, and fewer had any comfort to make long tarrying when they were there: and that abroad it retained not so much as the shadow of its ancient dignity."

---

[1] No. XXXVII.

At this low ebb the university now was, when King Edward the Sixth came to the sceptre. But there being a Parliament this year in the month of November, the chief officers thereof thought it advisable, however, to prevent it, if they could, from sinking lower, and to keep at least what they had, by getting their ancient privileges confirmed by that Parliament. And for this purpose they writ their earnest letters to the archbishop: John Madew, their vice-chancellor, the bearer, urging to him, "not only that it was a thing usual at the beginning of princes' reigns, to show that favour to the university to have their privileges renewed by Parliament; but chiefly, that the favour his grace should do to it would be a true piece of service to the religion which he had such a tender care of. That every one knew how much it concerned the commonwealth that account should be made of learning; but how much it concerned the pure religion (as they styled that of the Reformation), he alone did consider above all others. That he knew how that about five hundred years past, or more, the knowledge of letters, by the fault of kings, who ought to have cherished it, began to withdraw itself from men, and to hide itself in darkness. In which dark times, so involved in ignorance, that notable wild boar out of the wood spoiled the vineyard of Christ above measure: not only treading down the kings of the earth, and conferring upon himself the empire of the world, but so invaded and broke into the holy seat and temple of conscience, that now there were scarce any manners of men, any course of life, any rite of ceremonies, any sacrament of the Church, any footstep of Christ, which were not either laid waste by his thunder, or defiled by his breath: or, to speak in milder, but more significant terms with St. Paul, which were not most foully corrupted and adulterated by the wisdom of human-will worship. That it was this night of discipline, and want of knowledge, which robbed us of God's word, and advanced the empire of man's doctrine to that arbitrary height, that, instead of the true worship of God, the right using of things divine, a holy and pure course of life, hypocrisy, idolatry, and adultery were most cunningly conveyed and brought in. That they did the more willingly mention this pest of ignorance, conceiving great hope that the honour of learning would be restored anew, now when all things tended in a wonderful manner to the illustrating of true religion, which good learning did necessarily accompany. And that since God had now raised him up on purpose for the restoring of the Gospel, and had so long reserved him for that end, they doubted not but he would give all his pains and authority to preserve the welfare of learning. And that somewhat for this reason, because at that time there could happen no calamity or advantage thereunto, but every man would be apt either to charge him with the blame of the one, or attribute to him the praise of the other." This eloquent letter, indited by the pen of Ascham, then the university orator, having some remarkable passages of the state of the university at that time, and of the great sway the archbishop then carried in the public, and the marvellous goodwill he was esteemed to bear towards learning, I have therefore placed in the Appendix, though printed before.[1]

---

[1] Hist. Reform. part ii. p. 8 [vol. ii. pp. 11, *et seq.*].

This favour of having their privileges confirmed, sued for in the forementioned letter, the university then got, partly by the means of their cordial patron the archbishop, and partly by the intercession and friendship of Queen Katharine Par, a great favourer of learning and pure religion, of Wriothesly, lord chancellor; the earl of Warwick, the marquis of Northampton, the earl of Arundel, and Sir William Paget; to all whom at that time they addressed their letters: whether it were out of fear of the difficulty of getting the thing done, or to take this opportunity to obtain the countenance of the great men of the court.

Some time after, upon another occasion, the heads of the university made another application to their patron the archbishop, which was, to befriend them at court against the townsmen, their old enemies, who were now wresting from them one of their ancient undoubted privileges; namely, the use of the prisons of the Tollbooth and castle. The occasion was this: in the time of Sturbridge fair, the proctors, upon great complaints made to them, going their rounds one night, had taken certain evil persons in houses of sin, and had brought them to the Tollbooth, in order to the commitment of them there. But having sent to the mayor for the keys, he absolutely refused to part with them. So they were fain to carry their prisoners to the castle, where they left them in custody. But the mayor's son, after an hour or two, let them all out, to return, if they pleased, to their former lewdness, to the breach of law, and affront of the magistrate. Upon this the university sent their letters to the archbishop, making certain of their grave members the bearers, to relate the matter more fully; earnestly requiring that such insolence might be punished: and that the king and his council would make such men feel what it was to violate laws, and to cherish impunity, and to break their oaths, which they had taken to maintain the university privileges. They urged to him, "how serviceable and ready their university had been to him in his pious labours and counsels, in establishing the true doctrine in the Church; and what fit and worthy men they had sent him for his assistance in that good work. In like manner they required and expected of him, that their dignity might be maintained and preserved by his aid and authority. That the university was then but in a low condition, and that abroad it scarcely retained the shadow of its former glory. But if at home, and within itself, the bonds and sinews of its safety should thus be cut, as not to have a power to restrain vice by imprisonment, what could the kingdom, religion, and the king's majesty hope for any more from that university? They inculcated, how learning and the true religion rise and fall together; and that if it went otherwise than well with the one, the other would feel the smart of it. And truly," say they, "no remarkable damage can light upon the studies of learning, which by the same motion draws not along with it the true religion into the same catastrophe." And these considerations they made use of, to excite his grace to assist them in vindicating their privileges, and in having that gross infringement of them punished. Upon the same occasion they wrote their letters also to Sir William Paget, a great friend of theirs, and eminent patron of good learning. What the issue of these applications was, I find not; but may conclude they received a success proportionable to the goodwill and authority of those to whom they were made.

---

[1] No. XXXVIII.

And as the whole body of the university knew what favour our prelate bore to it, so every single ingenious member confided in him, and applied to him in their needs. Roger Ascham, the university orator, whom I had occasion to mention before,[1] was a man of a weak constitution, and had contracted more frailty by reason of a long ague that then hung about him, and his complexion became melancholy by the relics of that stubborn distemper. He had also in his nature a great averseness to the fish diet. Upon these reasons he addressed his letters to the archbishop with an humble suit, very handsomely penned, that he might be dispensed with as to abstinence from flesh meats, Lent and fish-days being then strictly observed in the colleges. And this license he desired might be not only temporary, but perpetual, as long as he lived; which was somewhat extraordinary. But to incline the archbishop to yield to his suit, he told him,

---

[1] [See above, p. 232.]

"That it was not to pamper his flesh, nor out of an affectation of doing that which was unusual, or against common custom, but only for the preserving his health, and that he might the more freely pursue his studies." He added, "That the air of Cambridge was naturally cold and moist, and so the fish-diet the more unwholesome. He desired, therefore, that by his authority he might no longer be tied by that tradition, which forbade the use of certain meats at certain times." He said, "that those who granted this liberty to none but such as laboured under a desperate disease, did like them who never repaired their houses but when they were just ready to fall down by age. Thrifty housekeepers did otherwise: so did skilful physicians, who did not use to prescribe their physic when it was too late, but always put a stop to beginnings. That they who never would impart the using of this liberty (of eating flesh) to any, but when all health was despaired of, knew not what good a prudent foresight did in all commonwealths, and did too insolently abuse a good thing bestowed upon us by God, when little or no use at all could be made of it. Nay, that such a good was no good at all, being external, but in that respect only, as there might some use be made of it. That we ought not therefore unprofitably to abuse food to diseases that are desperate, but to accommodate it to the preservation of health. And so did St. Paul command, 'Therefore I exhort you to take some food, for this is for your health.'" Then he subjoins a passage of Herodotus in his "Euterpe," concerning the Egyptian priests, from whom issued originally all kinds of learning and arts, and who were always conversant in learned studies. These, saith that author, religiously tied themselves ever to abstain from all eating of fish. "No doubt for this only cause," saith Ascham; "Ne ignea vis ingenii, atque præstantia, ullo frigido succo, quem esus piscium ingeneraret, extingueretur.—That the wits of men that have a noble fiery quality in them, might not be quenched by some cold juice, which the eating of fish might engender. And that it was somewhat unjust," he adds, "that when so many kinds of superstition flowed in such a plentiful measure from the Egyptians, as might easily be proved, and thence derived themselves, first to the Greeks, then to the Romans, and afterwards to our times, through that sink of Popery, that that single worthy counsel and remedy of those most learned men, enjoined for the enlarging and spreading of learning, should be debarred us to follow; and that by such as were either unlearned themselves, or superstitious men: whereby the best wits received so great prejudice and damage. That none knew better than his lordship whence this custom arose, by whom cherished, and by what kind of men brought down to us. And, lastly, how unwholesome and unfit all eating of fish was in the spring-time. And that he might obtain this favour, he would use it without giving offence, or making any common speech of it, with quietness and silence, with abstinence and thanksgiving."

This letter he got his friend Poinet, the archbishop's chaplain (the same I suppose who after was bishop of Winchester), to put in his grace's hand, and to further his request what he could. The issue whereof was to his heart's desire; for though the archbishop knew him not, nor was easily drawn to dispense with the Church's ancient discipline and rites, yet he received his suit with all humanity; and such he found to be the modesty and ingenuity of the man, and what he requested to be grounded upon such reasonable and just causes, that he readily yielded to it. And whether he thought it out of his power to grant a license of that latitude, to discharge a person for all time to come from the obligation of keeping Lent, or to avert the censure he might incur if he should have done it by his own authority, or reckoning it a matter of law rather than religion, he put himself to the trouble of procuring the king's license under the privy seal for this man; and when he had done that, considering an academic's poverty, he released him of the whole charges of taking it out, paying all the fees himself; and so conveyed it to him by Dr. Tayler, the master of his college.

And indeed the archbishop's opinion concerning Lent made way for his more ready yielding to Ascham's request; for he held the keeping of Lent as founded in a positive law, rather than as a religious duty, and thought it necessary that so the people should be taught and instructed. As appears by his articles of visitation in the second year of King Edward; one whereof ran thus: "That inquiry should be made, whether the curates had declared, and to their wit and power had persuaded the people, that the manner and kind of fasting in Lent, and other days in the year, was but a mere positive law; and that, therefore, all persons, having just cause of sickness, or other necessity, or being licensed by the king's majesty, may moderately eat all kind of meat, without grudge or scruple of conscience."[1]

The same Ascham, knowing well how the archbishop's mind stood affected to Cambridge, his old nurse, and how well he wished it for the sake of religion, acquainted him with the state of the university about the beginning of King Edward's reign, and the course of the studies that were then used. "That there were very many began to affect the study of divinity."[2] [A new study, it seems, then; the Pope's laws and the schoolmen having before employed the heads of almost all.] "That the doctrines of original sin and predestination were much canvassed: but many went rather according to Pighius, highly applauding him, than according to St. Augustin, though he exceeded all others that either went before, or followed after him, for the excellency of his wit and learning, and the greatness of his industry and opportunities. That others among them made the reading of God's word their daily exercise; and for the helping their understandings in the sense of it, they made use of, and adhered to, the judgment of St. Augustin chiefly; and studied hard the tongues. The knowledge of languages began to be affected; and such as studied them were reckoned the best masters; as qualifying them best for teaching of others, or understanding themselves. That for oratory, they plied Plato and Aristotle; from whose fountains among the Greeks, 'loquens illa prudentia' (as he styled oratory), *that speaking prudence* might be fetched. And to these among the Latins they added Cicero. They conversed also in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, the three lights of chronology, truth, and Greek eloquence; and which brought a great lustre to their other studies. The Greek poets, which they took delight in, were Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides; the one the fountain, the two others the streams, of all eloquence and learned poetry; which, they were of opinion, did more largely water their other studies than Terence or Virgil; which in some former years were chiefly read." Thus was the method of university studies altered (so much for the better), from reading the schoolmen and metaphysical niceties, the Pope's canons and decretals, to converse in politer and more manly learning, which tended so much to solid knowledge, and preparation of men's minds to the entertainment of the Gospel.

---

[1] [These articles of visitation are given in full in the Parker Society's edition of Archbishop Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 154, &c.]

[2] Epistol. libro 2.

The great setter on foot of this ingenious learning in the university was Sir John Cheke, of St. John's College, now preferred to be the king's tutor; a person for whom the archbishop had a very tender love and affectionate kindness. For so Ascham writ of him in his former letter: "That many had addicted themselves to this course of study by the aid and conduct, example and counsel, of that excellent man; that they bore the better his going from them to the court, who had brought them on in so good a course, because they knew their disprofit was abundantly recompensed by the profit and safety that would accrue to the whole commonwealth by him." Applying that of Plato to him, "Plurimum reipublicæin teresse, ut unus aliquis existat semper præstans excellensque vir, ad cujus virtutis imitationem, cæteri voluntate, industria, studio, et spe erecti, totos sese effingant et accommodent."

Afterwards he acquainted the most reverend person, to whom he wrote, with those things which proved great hinderances to the flourishing estate of the university, that by his counsel and authority, if possible, they might be redressed. And they were two. "The one was, that they wanted elderly men, very few such remaining among them, by whose example the younger sort might be excited to study, and by whose authority the manners of the rest might be rightly formed and fashioned. The other impediment was occasioned by such as were admitted; who were for the most part only the sons of rich men, and such as never intended to pursue their studies to that degree as to arrive at any eminent proficiency and perfection in learning, but only the better to qualify themselves for some places in the state, by a slighter and more superficial knowledge. The injury accruing thence to the university was double; both because, by this means, all hope of ripe and completed learning was immaturely cut off in the very bud; and also all the expectations of the poorer sort, whose whole time was spent in good studies, was eluded by these drones occupying those places and preferments which more properly belonged unto them; for parts, learning, poverty, and election, were of no strength at home, where favour and countenance, and the letters of noblemen, and such-like extraordinary and illegal courses from abroad, bore all the sway."

CHAPTER VII.

Dr. Smith and others recant.

And now, before I conclude this year, let me pass from more public matters, and present the reader with two or three passages, wherein the archbishop had to do with private men.

May the 15th, Richard Smith, D.D., master of Whittington College, and reader of divinity in Oxford,[1] a hot turbulent man, made his recantation at Paul's Cross, convinced and moved thereunto by the pains of the archbishop. What his errors were, that he had publicly vented in the university, and in his writings, may be known by the words of his recantation, which were these:—

"I do confess and acknowledge, that the authority, as well of the bishop of Rome, whose authority is justly and lawfully abolished in this realm, as of other bishops, and others called the ministers of the Church, consisteth in the dispensation and ministration of God's word, and not in making laws, ordinances, and decrees over the people, besides God's word, without the consent and authority of the prince and people. I say and affirm, that within this realm of England, and other the king's dominions, there is no law, decree, ordinance, or constitution ecclesiastical, in force, and available by any man's authority, but only by the king's majesty's authority, or of his Parliament."

---

[1] [See above, pp. 115, 228.]

This man had wrote two books in favour of Popish doctrine; and those he also now disclaimed, viz. a book of traditions, and another of the sacrifice of the mass. In the former of which he maintained, "That Christ and His apostles taught and left to the Church many things without writing, which," he asserted, "were steadfastly to be believed, and obediently fulfilled, under pain of damnation." In the other book he maintained, "that Christ was not a priest after the order of Melchizedeck, when He offered himself upon the cross for our sins, but after the order of Aaron: and that when Christ did offer His body to His Father, after the order of Melchizedeck, to appease His wrath, it was to be understood not of the sacrifice of the cross, but of the sacrifice that He made at His maundy, in form of bread and wine." In which book were other errors. He that is minded to see his recantation of these his books, may have it in the Appendix,[1] as I transcribed it out of an old book made by Becon, intituled, "Reports of certain Men." This recantation he not long after made at Oxon, viz. in August following: where he also protested openly, "That he would abide in the sincere and pure doctrine of Christ's Gospel, all human trifling traditions set apart, even unto death, though it should cost him his life." And this recantation he also printed, for further satisfaction to the world.

Bishop Gardiner, who was now at Winchester, was very uneasy at the news of this recantation, which some took care to bring down to him. He signified to the Protector, "That Smith was a man with whom he had no familiarity, nor cared for his acquaintance: that he had not seen him in three years, nor talked with him in seven. He was greatly displeased with the first words of his recantation (which yet were but the words of Scripture), 'Omnis homo mendax:'[2] making all the doctors in the Church (as he inferred) to be liars with himself: how it argued his pride; for he that sought for such company in lying, had small humility; and that he would hide himself by that number: that his depraving of man's nature in that sort was not the setting out of the authority of Scripture." He said, "he neither liked his tractation, nor yet his retractation. That he was mad to say in his book of Unwritten Verities, that bishops in this realm could make laws, wherein," he said, "he lied loudly." About this time Chadsey, Standish, Yong, Oglethorp, and divers others, recanted (whose recantations Fox[1] had by him to show), as well as Smith, whom we have now before us.

---

[1] No. XXXIX.

[2] Psal. cxvi. 11.

After this recantation he carried not himself according to it; but favoured the old errors: and in the year 1549 offered some affront unto Archbishop Cranmer, opposing him in the doctrine of the lawfulness of priests' marriage, and endeavoured to make a rout in Oxford, to the endangering Peter Martyr's life: and printed a book the same year against him, "De Votis Monasticis." Whereupon incurring, as he apprehended, some danger, he fled into Scotland. But weary of being there, and willing to have his peace made in England, he wrote two letters to the archbishop from thence; professing that he would out of hand, by open writing in the Latin tongue, revoke all that erroneous doctrine which he had before taught and published, and set forth the pure doctrine of Christ: and, for a proof hereof, he would straight after his return into England set forth a book in Latin, in defence of the most lawful marriage of priests. In the year 1550 he wrote certain treatises against Peter Martyr, printed at Louvain: and the same year came out his book against the archbishop's treatise of the sacrament.

This man was of a most inconstant, as well as turbulent spirit: for in the reign of Queen Mary he turned to the religion then professed; and was great with Bishop Bonner in those times, but greatly despised for his fickleness. He once attempted to discourse with Hawks in Bonner's house in London; Hawks threw in his dish his recantation. To which when he said it was no recantation, but a declaration, the other gave him this rub: "To be short, I will know, whether you will recant any more ere ever I talk with you, or believe you;" and so departed from him.[2] We shall hear of him again in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when he again complied, and submitted himself to Archbishop Parker: and last of all returned to his old opinions, and fled to Louvain.

---

[1] [Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 298.]

[2] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vii. p. 111.]

Pass we from this man to another of the same strain, with whom the archbishop had to do. As the Popish clergy in the former king's reign had made all the rudest and eagerest opposition they dared against the steps that were then made towards a Reformation, so they ceased not to do in this king's; nay, and more, hoping to shelter themselves under a milder government. One instance of this appeared in what was done by the *quondam* abbot of Tower Hill, London, who, for some recompense of the loss of his abbey, was made vicar of Stepney church; succeeding, I suppose, Mr. Hierome, burnt to death in the year 1540, with Dr. Barnes and Garret. He being a bold man, and addicted to the old superstition, would commonly disturb the preachers in his church, when he liked not their doctrine, by causing the bells to be rung when they were at the sermon; and sometimes beginning to sing in the choir before the sermon were half done; and sometimes by challenging the preacher in the pulpit: for he was a strong, stout, Popish prelate. Whom therefore the godly-disposed of the parish were weary of, and especially some of the eminentest men at Limehurst, whose names were Driver, Ive, Poynter, March, and others. But they durst not meddle with him, until one Underhil, of the band of gentlemen pensioners, of a good family, and well respected at court, came to live at Limehurst. He, being the king's servant, took upon him to reprehend this abbot for these and such-like his doings; and by his authority carried him unto Croydon to the archbishop there, the persons above-named going along as witnesses. In fine, the mild archbishop sent him away with a gentle rebuke, and bade him to do no more so. This lenity offended Underhil, who said, "My Lord, methinks you are too gentle unto so stout a Papist." To which Cranmer replied, "Well, we have no law to punish them by." "No law, my lord?" said the other. "If I had your authority, I would be so bold to unvicar him, or minister some sharp punishment upon him and such other. If ever it come to their turn, they will show you no such favour." "Well," said the good archbishop, "if God so provide, we must abide it." "Surely," replied the other again, "God will never con you thanks for this, but rather take the sword from such as will not use it upon his enemies." And so they parted. And this indeed was the constant behaviour of the archbishop towards Papists, and such as were his enemies. For which he was now, and at other times, taxed by men of hotter spirits; but his opinion was, that clemency and goodness, as it was more agreeable to the Gospel, which he laboured to adorn, so was more likely to obtain the ends he desired, than rigour and austerity.

The archbishop did one thing more this year of good conducement to the promoting true religion, and exposing false: and that was in countenancing and licensing an earnest preacher in the south-west parts, named Thomas Hancock, a master of arts, whose mouth had been stopped by a strict inhibition from preaching in the former king's reign. The archbishop saw well what a useful man he had been in those parts of England where he frequented, having been a very diligent preacher of the Gospel, and declaimer against Papal abuses, in the dioceses of two bigoted bishops, Gardiner of Winchester, and Capon of Sarum. In this first year of the king, many zealous preachers of the Gospel, without staying for public orders from above, earnestly set forth the evangelical doctrine, in confutation of the sacrifice of the mass, and the corporal presence in the sacrament, and such-like. And of the laity there were great numbers everywhere, especially in populous towns, of such as did now more openly show their heads, and their good inclinations to the *new learning*, as it was then called. In Southampton, of the diocese of Winchester; in Salisbury, Poole, and Dorset, of the diocese of Sarum; did this Hancock chiefly converse and officiate in the latter end of King Henry: when he was suspended *a celebratione divinorum*,[1] by Dr. Raynold, commissary under Dr. Steward, then chancellor to Bishop Gardiner, upon pretence of the breach of the act of Six Articles; because he had taught, out of the ninth to the Hebrews, "That our Saviour Christ entered once into the holy place, by the which He obtained unto us everlasting redemption. That He once suffered, and that

---

[1] Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxxv. 124].

His body was once offered, to take away the sins of many people. And that one only oblation sufficed for the sins of the whole world." And though all this was but mere Scripture, yet they found it to contradict their notions, and therefore they thought convenient to suspend him. But as these bishops did what they could to stifle all preaching of God's word, so the archbishop's principle was to encourage and send forth preachers. So Hancock, notwithstanding his former suspension, obtained a license from our archbishop to preach.

Now to follow this preacher a little after his license obtained. At Christ-Church, Twinham, in the county of Southampton, where he was born (as I take it from his own narration), he preached out of the sixteenth chapter of St. John: "The Holy Ghost shall reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, &c. because I go to the Father."[1] The priest being then at mass, Hancock declared unto the people, "That that the priest held over his head, they did see with their bodily eyes; but our Saviour Christ doth here say plainly, that we shall see Him no more. Then you," saith he, "that do kneel unto it, pray unto it, and honour it as God, do make an idol of it, and yourselves do commit most horrible idolatry." Whereat the vicar, Mr. Smith, sitting in his chair, in the face of the pulpit, spake these words: "Mr. Hancock, you have done well until now; and now have you played an ill cow's part, which, when she hath given a good mess of milk, overthroweth all with her foot, and so all is lost." And with these words he got him out of the church.

Also, in the first year of the king, the same person preached in St. Thomas' church, at Salisbury, Dr. Oking, chancellor to Bishop Capon, and Dr. Steward, chancellor to Bishop Gardiner, being present, with divers others of the clergy and laity. His place was, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted out." Whence he inveighed against the superstitious ceremonies, holy bread, holy water, images, copes, vestments, &c.; and at last against the idol of the altar, proving it to be an idol, and no God, by the first of St. John's Gospel,—"No man hath seen God at any time;" with other places of the Old

---

[1] Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxxv. 124].

Testament. But "that the priest held over his head, they did see, kneeled before it, honoured it; and so made an idol of it: and therefore they were most horrible idolaters." Whereat the doctors, and certain of the clergy, went out of the church. Hancock, seeing them departing, charged them, "They were not of God, because they refused to hear the word of God." But when the sermon was ended, Thomas Chaffen, the mayor, set on, as is likely, by some of the clergy, came to him, laying to his charge the breach of a proclamation, lately set forth by the lord Protector, "That no nicknames should be given unto the sacrament, as *Round Robin*, or *Jack in the box*." Whereto he replied, "That it was no sacrament, but an idol, as they used it." But, for all this excuse, the mayor had committed him to gaol, had not six honest men been bound for his appearance at the next assizes, to make his answer: as Dr. Jeffery about this time had committed two to prison for the like cause.

So that now, if we look back upon this first year of the king, we may perceive how busy and diligent our archbishop was in redressing abuses, and restoring the Church to its true state of Christian piety and devotion; by procuring a royal visitation over England for inspection into the manners and abilities of the clergy, and for taking away of superstitions; by getting a book of plain Homilies to teach the common people (in the composing whereof he himself had a very great hand), and Erasmus' Paraphrase in English upon the New Testament, for the better furnishing the clergy and others with a sound and sober understanding of the Scriptures; and by encouraging preachers, and such-like means. So that if you would particularly know in what forwardness the archbishop had already put religion, taking in his endeavours in the last king's reign hitherto, I recommend to your reading his homily or sermon "Of Good Works:"[1] showing out of what abundance of superstitions the Church was now emerged. "Briefly, to pass over the ungodly and counterfeit religion [he means, of monks and friars], let us rehearse some other kinds of Papistical superstitions and abuses, as of beads, of lady-psalters and rosaries, of fifteen O's, of St. Bernard's Verses, of St. Agathe's Letters, of Purgatory, of masses satisfactory, of stations and jubilees, of feigned relics, or hallowed beads, bells, bread, water, psalms, candles, fire, and such other. Of superstitious fastings, of fraternities or brotherhoods, of pardons, with such-like merchandise: which were so esteemed or abused, to the great prejudice of God's glory and commandments, that they were made most high and most holy things; whereby to attain to the everlasting life, or remission of sins. Yea also vain inventions, unfruitful ceremonies, and ungodly laws, decrees, and conceits of Rome; wherein such were advanced, that nothing was thought comparable in authority, wisdom, learning, and godliness unto them. So that the laws of Rome, as they said, were to be received of all men, as the four Evangelists: to the which all the laws of princes must give place. And the laws of God also partly were left off, and less esteemed, that the said laws, decrees, and councils, with their traditions and ceremonies, might be more duly kept, and had in greater reverence. Thus were the people, through ignorance, so blinded with the godly show and appearance of those things, that they thought the keeping of them to be more holiness, more perfect service and honouring of God, and more pleasing to God, than the keeping of God's commandments. Such have been the corrupt inclinations of man, ever superstitiously given to make new honouring of God of his own head; and then to have more affection and devotion to keep that, than to search out God's holy commandments, and to keep them. And furthermore, to take God's commandments for man's commandments, and man's commandments for God's commandments, yea, and for the highest and most perfect and holiest of all God's commandments. And so was all confused, that scant well-learned men, and but a small number of them, knew, or at the least would know, and durst affirm the truth, to separate or sever God's commandments from the commandments of men. Whereupon did grow such error, superstition, and idolatry, vain religion, overthwart judgment, great contention, with all ungodly living."

---

[1] Part iii.

A Bishop consecrated.

September the 5th, being Sunday, Nicolas Ridley, D.D., prebend of Canterbury, was consecrated bishop of Rochester by Henry [Holbeach] bishop of Lincoln, assisted by John, suffragan of Bedford, and Thomas, suffragan of Sidon, in the chapel belonging to the house of May, dean of St. Paul's.[1] He was consecrated according to the old custom of the Church, by the unction of holy chrism, as well as imposition of hands. Present, among others, John Whytwel, the archbishop's almoner; Rich. Taylor, M.A., Nic. Bullingham, Gregory Tod, and Tho. Bernard, his chaplains.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Church's Goods embezzled. New Opinions broached.

As the reformation of abuses in religion went forward under such a king and such an archbishop, so there wanted not for evils accompanying it, as there do commonly the best things; the profaneness of some, and the covetousness of others, giving occasion thereunto. Sacred places, set apart for divine worship, were now greatly profaned; and so probably had been before by ill custom: for in many churches, cathedral as well as other, and especially in London, many frays, quarrels, riots, and bloodsheddings were committed. They used also commonly to bring horses and mules into and through churches, and shooting off handguns; "making the same, which were properly appointed to God's service and common prayer, like a stable or common inn, or rather a den or sink of all unchristiness;" as it was expressed in a proclamation[2] which the king set forth about this time, as I suppose (for I am left to conjecture for the date), by reason of the insolency of great numbers using the said evil demeanors, and daily more and more increasing; "therein forbidding any such quarrelling, shooting, or bringing horses and mules into or through the churches, or by any other means irreverently to use the churches, upon pain of his majesty's indignation, and imprisonment." For it was not thought fit that, when divine worship was now reforming, the places for the said worship should remain unreformed.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. 321.
[2] Cotton Lib. Titus b. ii. 39.

Beside the profanation of churches, there prevailed now another evil, relating also to churches, viz. That the utensils and ornaments of these sacred places were spoiled, embezzled, and made away, partly by the churchwardens, and partly by other parishioners. Whether the cause were, that they would do that themselves, which they imagined would ere long be done by others, viz. robbing the churches; which, it may be, those that bore an ill-will to the Reformation might give out, to render it the more odious. But certain it is, that it now became more or less practised all the nation over, to sell or take away chalices, crosses of silver, bells, and other ornaments. For the stopping of this, in the month of April, the Protector, and the lords of the council, writ to our archbishop this letter, upon the information and complaint, as it is likely, of the said archbishop himself, in whose diocese especially this sacrilege prevailed.

"After our right hearty commendations. Whereas we are informed that the churchwardens and parochians of divers parishes do alienate and sell away their chalices, crosses of silver, bells, and other ornaments of the church, which were not given for that purpose, to be alienated at their pleasure; but either to be used to the intent that they were at first given, or to some other necessary and convenient service of the church. Therefore this is to will and require you, immediately upon the sight hereof, to give strait charge and commandment, on the king's majesty's behalf, to every parish church within your diocese, that they do in no wise sell, give, or otherwise alienate any bells, or other ornament, or jewels, belonging unto their parish church, upon pain of his highness' displeasure, as they will answer to the contrary at their peril. Thus fare you well. From Westminster, the last day of April, 1548.

"Your loving friends,

"E. SOMERSET,	THOMAS CHEYNEY,
H. ARUNDEL,	A. DENNY,
THOMAS SMITH,	J. RUSSEL,
JOHN BAKER,	WILLIAM PAGET,
WILL. SEINT-JOHN,	W. HERBERT."[1]

It is not an improbable conjecture, that the archbishop procured this letter to arm churchwardens with an answer to such greedy courtiers and gentlemen, as used often to resort to them; and in their own, or the council's name, required these goods of their churches to be yielded up to them; and threatened them if they did not.

The next month the council sent the archbishop a form of prayer, to be used by himself and those of his diocese. Wherein God was implored to grant the nation peace and victory over her enemies; for now all things round about appeared in a posture of war; and preparation of arms was making, which caused the king also to raise forces. And, for a blessing upon them, the privy council sent to the archbishop, together with the form, an order for the speedy using of it. The tenor of the letter follows:—

"After our hearty commendations to your good lordship. Hearing tell of great preparation made of foreign princes, and otherwise being enforced, for the procurement and continuance of peace, to make the preparation of war; forasmuch as all power and aid valuable cometh of God, the which He granteth, as He hath promised by His holy word, by nothing so much as by hearty prayer of good men; the which is also of more efficacy, made of an whole congregation together, gathered in His holy name; therefore this is to will and require you to give advertisement and commandment to all the curates in your diocese, that every Sunday and holy-day, in their common prayer, they make devout and hearty intercessions to Almighty God for victory and peace. And to the intent that you should not be in doubt what sort and manner thereof we do like, we have sent unto you one; the which we would that you and they should follow, and read it instead of one of the collects of the king's majesty's procession. Thus we pray you not fail to do with all speed, and bid you farewell. From Westminster, the 6th of May, 1548.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [55].

"Your loving friends,

"E. SOMERSET, THOMAS CHEYNEY,
J. RUSSEL, W. SEINT-JOHN."[1]
R. RICH, Canc.

[To our very good lord the archbishop of Canterbury.]

Now that the liberty of the Gospel began to be allowed, divers false opinions and unsound doctrines began to be vented with it; of which public cognizance began now to be taken. As, "that the elect sinned not, and that they could not sin. That they that be regenerate never fall away from godly love. That the elect have a right to take so much of the things of the world as may supply their necessities." And there were some that openly preached these doctrines, and set forth and published books to the same tenor.

Several of these heretics, in the month of April, were convented before the archbishop of Canterbury;[2] Sir Thomas Smith; Richard Cox, Hugh Latimer, doctors of divinity; William May, dean of St. Paul's; William Cook, Richard Lyel, doctors of law; and others the king's commissioners. Then did one John Champneys, of Stratford on the Bow, abjure. He taught, and wrote, and defended; "1. That a man, after he is regenerate in Christ, cannot sin. 2. That the outward man might sin, but the inward man could not. 3. That the Gospel hath been so much persecuted and hated ever since the Apostles' times, that no man might be suffered openly to follow it. 4. That godly love falleth never away from them which be regenerate in Christ; wherefore they cannot do contrary to the commandments of Christ. 5. That that was the most principal of our marked men's doctrine, to make the people believe that there was no such spirit given unto men, whereby they should remain righteous, and always in Christ. Which is [as he wrote and asserted] a most devilish error. 6. That God doth permit to all His elect people their bodily necessities of all earthly things."

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [55].

[2] Cranm. Regist. [72].

All these he revoked; granting or confessing now,—"1. That a man, after he is regenerate in Christ, may sin, being destitute of His spirit. 2. That the inner man doth sin, when the outward man sinneth actually with the consent of the mind. 3. That divers times, since the Apostles' times, hath it been suffered to follow openly the doctrine of Christ. 4. That godly love falleth from them that be regenerate in Christ, being destitute of His spirit; and that then they may do contrary to the commandments of Christ. 5. That it is no erroneous doctrine, which he affirmed in his book to be a devilish error, and our marked men's doctrine, viz. To make the people believe that there was no such spirit given unto man, whereby he should remain righteous always in Christ. But I confess, [saith the abjurer,] that a man, having the spirit, may afterwards fall, and not be righteous. 6. That God doth not permit to all His elect people their bodily necessities of all worldly things to be taken, but by a law and order approved by the civil policy; in which by me now spoken I mean, nor understand any other sense than hath been here opened;" to use again his very words in his abjuration. And so, touching the Holy Gospel with his hand, before the king's commissioners, he abjured, promising, "That he should never hold, teach, believe, [write, print, or cause to be written or printed], the said errors, [heresies,] or damned opinions above rehearsed." And so subscribed his name.

Then the archbishop in his own name, and in the name of the other commissioners, gave him his oath: "1. That he should not by any means hereafter teach or preach to the people, nor set forth any kind of books, in print or otherwise, nor cause to be printed or set forth any such books, that should contain any manner of doctrine, without a special license thereunto of the king's majesty, or some of his grace's privy council, first had and obtained. 2. That the said Champneys, with all speed convenient, and with all his diligence, procure as many of his books, as are passed forth in his name, to be called in again, and utterly destroyed, as much as in him should lie. 3. That he should the Sunday follwing attend at Paul's Cross upon the preacher, all the time of the sermon, and there penitently stand before the [said] preacher with a fagot on his shoulder." And then he had two sureties bound in five hundred pounds, that he should perform his penance. This was done April 27.

There were other heresies also now vented abroad, as the denial of the Trinity, and of the deity of the Holy Ghost; and the assertion, that Jesus Christ was a mere man, and not true God, because he had the accidents of human nature; such as hungering and thirsting, and being visible; and that the benefit men receive by Jesus Christ was the bringing them to the true knowledge of God. There was one John Assheton, a priest, that preached these doctrines;[1] who on the 28th of December was summoned to Lambeth, to appear there before the archbishop. Where John Whitwel, the archbishop's almoner, and Thomas Langley, both priests, and his grace's chaplains, exhibited a schedule of divers heresies and damned opinions against the said Assheton; which are recited in the abjuration which he made. The tenor whereof is as followeth :—

"In the name of God, Amen. Before you, most learned father in God, Thomas, archbishop, primate, and metropolitan of all England, commissary of our most dread sovereign lord, and excellent prince, Edward VI., by the grace of God, &c. I, John Assheton, priest, of my pure heart, free-will, voluntary and sincere knowledge, confess and openly recognise, that in times past I thought, believed, said, held, and [presumptuously] affirmed [by subscription of my proper hand-writing], these errors, heresies, and damnable opinions following; that is to say, 1. That the Trinity of Persons was established by the Confession of Athanasius, declared by a psalm, *Quicunque vult*, &c.; and that the Holy Ghost is not God, but only a certain power of the Father. 2. That Jesus Christ, that was conceived of the Virgin Mary, was a holy prophet, and especially beloved of God the Father; but that He was not the true and living God; forasmuch as He was seen, and lived, hungered, and thirsted. 3. That this only is the fruit of Jesus Christ's passion; that whereas we were strangers from God, and had no knowledge of His testament, it pleased God by Christ to bring us to the acknowledging of His holy power by the testament.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [73].

Wherefore I, the said John Assheton, detesting and abhorring all and every my said errors, heresies, and damned opinions, willingly, and with all my power, affecting hereafter firmly to believe in the true and perfect faith of Christ and His Holy Church, purposing to follow the true and sincere doctrine of Holy Church with a pure and free heart, voluntary mind, will, and intent utterly to forsake, relinquish, renounce, and despise the said detestable errors, heresies, and abominable opinions; granting and confessing now,—1. That the blessed Trinity consisteth in three distinct persons, and one Godhead; as God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, coequal in power and might. 2. That Jesus Christ is both God and man, after His holy nature eternally begotten of His Father, of His own substance; in His humanity was conceived by the Holy Ghost incarnate, and for our redemption, being very God, became man. 3. That by the death of Jesus Christ we be not only made partakers of His testament, and so deduced to the knowledge of His godly will and power, but also that we have full redemption and remission of our sins in His blood." Then he subscribed his hand to this confession before the archbishop, exhibiting it for his act; and, lifting up his hand, beseeched his grace to deal mercifully and graciously with him; and touching the Gospel, gave his faith that he would faithfully and humbly obey the commands of the Holy Mother Church, and whatsoever penance the said most reverend father should lay upon him.

To these erroneous doctrines we must add others, that now also spread themselves; as, that Christ took not flesh of the Virgin; that the baptism of infants was not profitable. Of which error one Michael Thombe of London, butcher, recanted the year following, viz. 1549, May 11, having been then convented before the archbishop at Lambeth:—

"I, Michael Thombe of London, butcher, of my pure heart and free will, voluntarily and sincerely acknowledge,[1] confess, and openly recognise, that in times past I thought, believed, said, held, and affirmed, these errors, heresies, and damnable opinions following; that is to say, that [whether] Christ took no flesh of our Lady; and [whether I believe that I have said] that the baptism of infants is not profitable, because it goeth before faith. Wherefore I, the said Michael Thombe, detesting and abhorring all and every such my said errors, heresies, and damned opinions; [willing] and with all my power affecting hereafter firmly to believe in the true and perfect faith of Christ, and of His Holy Church, purposing to follow the true and sincere doctrine of Holy Church with a pure and free heart, voluntary mind, will, and intent, utterly to forsake, relinquish, renounce, and despise the said detestable errors, heresies, and abominable opinions; granting and confessing now, that Christ took flesh of the Virgin Mary, and that the baptism of infants is profitable and necessary." And by this submission and penance doing, Thombe escaped.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [74].

But another of the same opinion, more obstinate, came to a sadder end, and was burnt; namely, Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent.[1] Her opinion is in the instrument drawn up against her in the archbishop's Register, which ran thus:—

---

[1] [Cranm. Regist. 75:—"And here, although but indirectly connected with our present author, it may be allowable to remark, how much undeserved odium has been thrown upon Archbishop Cranmer in connexion with this case of Joan Bocher, in consequence of an erroneous statement of Fox, the martyrologist, respecting the importunity with which he urged, if not forced, the young king into the signature of the death-warrant upon which she suffered. All classes of objectors to the Reformation have availed themselves of this presumed fact, to magnify the clemency of the king by way of contrast to the primate's 'importunity for blood.'* Cranmer's advocates have apparently felt this passage in his life to be one extremely difficult, if not incapable, of defence. They have mostly contented themselves with alleging that it was contrary to the general tenour of his life, and with bringing forward the entry in the privy-council book to prove that he was not present when her fate was finally determined, and may therefore be presumed to have exhibited but little of the eager spirit of a persecutor. The last writer of a history of the Reformation† has gone a little farther, and has ventured to impugn the authority of this particular passage in Fox, on the ground of the silence not merely of the king's journal, but also of the Romanist libellers of the primate, respecting the alleged interview. Nothing is more likely than that if the king's feeling had been such as Fox represents, the entry in his journal

---

* Haywards' Ed. VI. p. 16, ed. 1636.

† Soames, iii. 544.

"That you believe that the Word was made flesh in the Virgin's belly; but that Christ took flesh of the Virgin,

would have been different from the one we find there;* whilst, if such an interview had really taken place, Sanders, and other writers of that class, would have been delighted to avail themselves of it against Cranmer; but it is unfortunate that Cranmer's defenders have not produced the whole entry in the privy-council book, instead of merely referring to it, in proof of the single fact of Cranmer's absence. Had that been done, it would long ago have occurred to some one, that it contains evidence that Fox's story, for which he does not assign any authority, could not be true. Amongst the minutes of the business transacted by the council (who, be it remembered, under the will of Henry VIII. were the actual governors of the kingdom during the minority of Edward VI.), on the 27th April, 1550, is the following entry:—

> 'A warrant to the L. Chauncellor to make out a writt to the Shireff of London for the execuçon of Johan of Kent, condempned to be burned for certein detestable opinions of heresie.'

"It appears from these words, that in conformity with the ordinary legal practice of the period, Joan Bocher was executed upon a writ *de hæretico comburendo,* addressed to the Sheriff of London, and issued out of Chancery, upon the authority of a warrant signed, not by the king, but by the council. It would have been contrary to constitutional custom for the king to have signed any such document; it is quite clear, from the entry quoted, that, in point of fact, he did not sign it; and the narrative which the worthy martyrologist was misled into inserting, and Cranmer's difficulty to cause the king to 'put to his hand,' and the tears by which subsequent writers have declared that his submission to the stern pleading of his spiritual father were accompanied, all vanish."†

---

* "Joan Bocher, otherways called Joan of Kent, was burnt for holding: That Christ was not incarnate of the Virgin Mary; being condemned the year before, but kept in hope of conversion; and the 30th of April the bishop of London and the bishop of Ely were to perswade her, but she withstood them, and reviled the preacher that preached at her death."

† "That no doubt may remain upon the subject I will add, 1. That it was not customary for the king to attend the meetings of the council. 2. That whenever the council desired that the king should be consulted or communicated with, an entry was made upon the council book similar to the following, which occurs on the same day as the preceding: 'It was agreed by the whole counsaill, that the king's majestie should be moved for the restitution of the duke of Somersett unto all his goods, his deptes, and his leases yet ungiven.' 3. That the persons present on the day referred to were: the Lorde Chauncellor, the L. High Threasorer, the L. P. Seale, the L. Great Chamberlaine, the L. Pagett, the Busshopp of Ely, Mr. Threasorer, Mr. Comptroller, Mr. of the Horse, Mr. Vicechamberlaine, Sir Rauf Sadler, Sir Edward

you believe not, because the flesh of the Virgin being the outward man, was sinfully gotten, and born in sin. But the Word, by the consent of the inward man of the Virgin, was made flesh." This she stood perversely in. So the archbishop himself excommunicated her judicially; the sentence being read by him, April 12, 1549, in St. Mary's chapel, within the cathedral church of Paul's, Sir Thomas Smith, William Cook, dean of the Arches, Hugh Latimer, Richard Lyell, LL.D., the king's commissioners, assisting. She was committed afterwards to the secular arm; and certified so to be by an instrument made by the commissioners to the king. After she was condemned, she was a sevennight in the Lord Chancellor Rich's house; and every day the archbishop and Bishop Ridley came and reasoned with her, that, if possible, they might save her from the fire; but nothing would do. I will here produce Latimer's censure of her, who well knew her case, being one of the commissioners that sat upon her. "She would say," saith he in his sermon on St. John Evangelist's day, "that our Saviour was not very man, nor had received flesh of his mother Mary; and yet she could show no reason why she should believe so. Her opinion was this:—The Son of God, said she, penetrated through her as through a glass, taking no substance of her. This foolish woman denied the common creed, *Natus ex Maria Virgine*, and said that our Saviour had a fantastical body."[1]

A Dutchman, an Arian, named George van Paris, denying Christ to be true God, came to a like end with Joan, namely, that of burning to death, being condemned for heresy; that was in the year 1551. But though I make some anticipation in my history, yet I do it that I may lay these heresies here together, that started up, or rather showed themselves more visibly, in this reign.

---

[1] [See Parker Society's edition of Bishop Latimer's Works, vol. ii. p. 114.]

Northe."—Preface, by John Bruce, Esq. F.S.A., to Parker Society's edition of the Works of Roger Hutchinson, pp. iii. iv. v. In the Ecclesiastical History Society's edition of this work, the names of the two bishops are stated—viz. Ridley and Goodrich. The preacher alluded to is also said to have been Dr. Scory, afterwards bishop of Rochester.]

CHAPTER IX.

The Archbishop visits.

The archbishop in this year held a visitation in divers places throughout his diocese, wherein inquiry was to be made concerning the behaviour both of the priests and the people, in eighty-six articles. Whereby may be seen the archbishop's conscientious care and solicitude for the abrogating of superstition, and the promoting of true religion: that he might reduce the clergy to learning, sobriety, and diligence in their vocation; and the people to loyalty and obedience to the king, and the sincere worshipping of God.

Concerning the priests, he ordered inquiry to be made; "Whether they preached four times a year against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, and in behalf of the king's power and authority within his own realms. Whether, in their common prayers, they used not the collects made for the king, and mentioned not his majesty's name in the same. Whether they had destroyed and taken away out of the churches all images and shrines, tables, candlesticks, trindals, or rolls of wax, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, idolatry, and superstition; and moved their parishioners to do the same in their own houses. Inquiries were made concerning their due administration of the sacraments; concerning their preaching God's word once at least in a quarter; and then exhorting their parishioners to works commanded by Scripture, and not to works devised by men's fancies, as wearing and praying upon beads, and such like. Concerning the plain reciting the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and Ten Commandments in English, immediately after the Gospel, as often as there were no sermon. Concerning the examining of every one that came to confession in Lent, whether they were able to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments, in English. Concerning the having learned curates, to be procured by such as were absent from their benefices. Concerning having the whole Bible of the largest volume in every church, and Erasmus' Paraphrase in English. Concerning teaching the people of the nature of the fast of Lent, and other days in the year, that it was but a mere positive law. Concerning residence upon benefices and keeping hospitality. Concerning finding a scholar in the universities, or some grammar-school, incumbent on such priests as had an hundred pounds a year. Concerning moving the parishioners to pray rather in English than in a tongue unknown, and not to put their trust in saying over a number of beads. Concerning having the New Testament in Latin and English, and Erasmus' Paraphrase, which all priests under the degree of bachelors in divinity were examined about. Concerning putting out of the church-books the name of Papa, and the name and service of Thomas Becket, and the prayers that had rubrics, containing pardons and indulgences." And many the like articles: which may be seen by him that will have recourse to them, as they are printed in Bishop Sparrow's Collections.

Those articles that related to the laity were, "Concerning the letters or hinderers of the word of God read in English, or preached sincerely. Concerning such as went out of the church in time of the litany, or common-prayer, or sermon. Concerning ringing bells at the same time. Concerning such as abused the ceremonies, as casting holy-water upon their beds, bearing about them holy-bread, St. John's Gospel; keeping of private holy-days, as tailors, bakers, brewers, smiths, shoemakers, &c. did. Concerning the misbestowing of money arising from cattle, or other moveable stocks of the church, as for finding of lights, torches, tapers, or lamps, and not employed to the poor man's chest. Concerning abusing priests and ministers. Concerning praying upon the English Primer, set forth by the king, and not the Latin, for such as understand not Latin. Concerning keeping the Church-holy-day, and the Dedication-day, any otherwise, or at any other time, than was appointed. Concerning commoning and jangling in the church at the time of reading the common-prayer or homilies, or when there was preaching. Concerning maintenance of error and heresy. Concerning common swearers, drunkards, blasphemers, adulterers, bawds. Inquiries were also to be made after such as were common brawlers, slanderers; such as used charms, sorceries, enchantments, and witchcraft; such as contemned their own parish-church, and went elsewhere.

Concerning marrying within the degrees prohibited, and without asking the banns. Concerning the honest discharge of wills and testaments, in such as were executors or administrators. Concerning such as contemned married priests, and refused to receive the communion and other sacraments at their hands. Concerning such as kept in their own houses images, tables, pictures, painting, or monuments of feigned miracles undefaced, &c."

In this year also the archbishop, with the dean and chapter of Canterbury, granted the patronage, rectory, &c. of Riceborough Monachorum, in the county of Bucks, to the Lord Windsor, for fourscore and nineteen years: and, in exchange, the said lord granted to the archbishop the advowson, patronage, and nomination of Midley in Kent, for the same duration of years.

September the 9th, being Sunday, Robert Farrar, D.D., was consecrated bishop of St. David's, by Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, endued with his pontificals, and assisted by Henry [Holbeach], bishop of Lincoln, and Nicolas [Ridley], bishop of Rochester, at Chertsey in the diocese of Winton, in the archbishop's house there. Then certain hymns, psalms, and prayers being recited, together with a portion of Scripture read in the vulgar tongue out of St. Paul's Epistles, and the Gospel of St. Matthew, the archbishop celebrated the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. There communicated the reverend fathers, Thomas [Goodrich], bishop of Ely; Thomas [Thirlby], bishop of Westminster; Henry, bishop of Lincoln; Nicolas, bishop of Rochester; and Farrar, the new bishop; together with William May, dean of St. Paul's; Simon Hains, dean of Exon; Thomas Robertson, and John Redman, professors of divinity, and others. The archbishop then distributed the communion in English words. This bishop (as it is writ in the margin of the Register), was the first that was consecrated upon the bare nomination of the king, according to the statute that for that purpose was published in the first year of his reign. The form of the king's letters patent, whereby he constituted Farrar bishop, is extant in the Register, dated from Leghes, August 1, in the second year of his reign.[1]

---

[1] [Cranm. Regist. fol. 327.]

At this bishop of St. David's,[1] I will stay a little; proving unhappy by his preferment unto a church, whose corruptions while he endeavoured to correct, he sunk under his commendable endeavours. He was an active man, and made much use of in public affairs in King Henry and King Edward's days; having been first a canon of St. Mary's in Oxon. He was with Bishop Barlow,[2] when he was by King Henry sent ambassador to Scotland, anno 1535. Another time employed in carrying old books of great value from St. Oswald's, a dissolved monastery, as it seems, unto the archbishop of York. And in the royal visitation in the beginning of King Edward, he was one of the king's visitors, being appointed one of the preachers, for his great ability in that faculty; and being chaplain to the duke of Somerset, was by his means advanced to be bishop; and upon his fall he fell into great troubles. This bishop, not long after his first entrance upon his bishopric, resolved to visit his diocese, like a careful pastor, hearing of very great corruptions in it, and particularly among those that belonged to the chapter of the church of Carmarthen; and chiefly Thomas Young, chanter, after archbishop of York (who pulled] down the great hall in the palace there for lucre of the lead), and Rowland Merick, one of the canons, after bishop of the said see of St. David's, and father to Sir Gilly Merick, that came to an untimely death, by being in the business of the earl of Essex. These two, having been before commissaries of this diocese, had spoiled the cathedral church of crosses, chalices, and censers; with other plate, jewels, and ornaments, to the value of five hundred marks or more; and converted them to their own private benefit; and had sealed many blanks (*sede vacante*) without the king's license or knowledge. Whereupon the bishop issued out his commission to his chancellor for visiting the chapter, as well as the rest of the diocese. But the commission was, it seems, drawn up amiss by the said chancellor, to whom the bishop left the forming the draught: for it ran in the old popish form, and so the king's supremacy not sufficiently acknowledged therein; though he professed to visit in the king's name and authority. This these two, in combination with his own ingrateful register, George Constantine, whom he had preferred, took their advantage of; not only to disobey the said commission, but to accuse the poor bishop of a *præmunire:* for which he was fain to go down from London, whither they had before brought him up, to answer at the assizes of Carmarthen. And when, by reason of the molestations they gave him, and their detaining him in London, he could not be so exact in paying in the tenths, and first-fruits, and subsidies, due from the clergy of his diocese; they took hold of this as another crime to lay to his charge. And hereupon, in fine, he was kept in prison a long time, and so remained when Queen Mary entered upon the government: upon which occasion he fell into the hands of the pope's butchers; who at last, for maintaining the truth, sent him into his diocese, and burnt him at a stake. And thus these men became the instruments of his death.

---

[1] [A long account of this bishop will be found in Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vii. pp. 3, *et seq.*]

[2] William Barlow occupied the sees of St. David's, Bath, and Wells, before the reign of Queen Mary; after Queen Elizabeth's accession he was nominated to Chichester, on the removal of John Christopherson.]

In their vexatious suits against this good bishop, undertaken the better to conceal their own faults, our archbishop seemed to be engaged, giving too much credit to the ill reports that Farrar's enemies raised against him, in a great heap of frivolous and malicious articles, exhibited to the king's council, who appointed Sir John Mason and Dr. Wotton to examine them; though, I suppose, our pious archbishop afterwards saw through this malice, and forbore any further to give influence to those that prosecuted this honest man; understanding by letters, which that afflicted man sent, both to him and Bishop Goodrich, lord chancellor, his unjust vexations wrought by his adversaries. One whereof, I mean his register, remained register to that very popish bishop that succeeded him; nay, and was assistant at his trial and condemnation. In short, hear what one writes that lived nearer those times, and might therefore be presumed to know more of these matters:—

"This was a conspiracy of his enemies against him, and of wicked fellows who had robbed the church, kept concubines, falsified records, and committed many other gross abuses."[1] To conclude, I find, by a private letter written to John Fox,[1] that these men, knowing how they had wronged the good bishop, came to him before his death, and asked him forgiveness; and he, like a good Christian, forgave them, and was reconciled to them.

---

[1] Sutclif's Answer to Parson's Threefold Convers. of England, [p. 41].

CHAPTER X.

The Archbishop answers the Rebels' Articles.

The commons this year brake out into a dangerous rebellion; and though they were once or twice appeased, and scattered in some places, yet they made insurrections in others; and chiefly in Devon, where they were very formidable for their numbers. The reason they pretended was double. The one was, the oppression of the gentry in enclosing of their commons from them—the other, the laying aside the old religion; which, because it was old, and the way their forefathers worshipped God, they were very fond of. The Lord Russel, lord privy seal, who was sent against them, offering to receive their complaints, the rebels sent them to him, drawn up under fifteen articles: as before they had sent their demands in seven articles, and a protestation that they were the king's body and goods. In answer to which the king sent a message to them, that may be seen in Fox.[2] They sent also a supplication to the king: to the which an answer was made by the king's learned counsel.

I shall take notice only of the fifteen articles, unto which our archbishop drew up an excellent answer at good length; for no man was thought so fit as he to open and unravel these men's requests, and to unfold the unreasonableness of them; and to show what real mischief they would pluck down upon themselves and the nation, should all the decrees of our forefathers, and the Six Articles, be revived again, and what great injury religion would receive, should the Latin masses and images, and the worshipping the sacrament, and purgatory, and abbeys, be restored; and Cardinal Pole come home, and the English Bible be called in, and such-like things, which their demands consisted of. This answer of the archbishop I judge worthy preserving (and therefore, though somewhat long, I have laid in the Appendix);[1] because it will show his wisdom, learning, and the knowledge of the state of the kingdom that he was furnished with. I met with these writings in the manuscript library of Benet College, being the rough draught of them, all under the archbishop's own hand. He charged them with ignorance in putting up such articles: and concluded it not to be their own minds to have them granted, had they understood them, but that they were indeed devised by some priests, and rank papists and traitors to the realm, which he would not so much as think of them. So that he gently told them, that he must use the same expression to them, that Christ did to James and John, "They asked they wot not what."

---

[1] [This letter is extant in the Harl. MSS. ccccxvi. 170.]

[2] [Acts and Monuments, vol. v. pp. 732—736.]

The archbishop wrote this answer after the rout at Exeter given them by the Lord Russel, and the taking prisoners divers of their captains and priests, and between the condemnation and execution of Humphrey Arundel, and Bray, mayor of Bodmin, whom he prayed God to make penitent before their deaths, to which they were adjudged. For which two the rebels, in one of their articles, had required safe conduct to make their grievances known to the king: as they had, in another article, demanded two divines of the same popish stamp, to be sent to them to preach, namely, Moreman and Crispin, who both seemed now, being priests of that country, to be under restraint upon suspicion—men, as the archbishop told them, ignorant of God's word, but of notable craft, wilfulness, and dissimulation, and such as would poison them, instead of feeding them. Of Crispin I find little, but that he was once proctor of the university of Oxon, and doctor of the faculty of physic, and of Oriel College. Moreman was beneficed in Cornwall in King Henry's time, and seemed to go along with that king in his steps of reformation, and was observed to be the first that taught his parishioners the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments in English; yet showing himself in the next king's reign a zealot for the old superstitions. Hence we perceive the reason why the archbishop charged him to be a man full of craft and hypocrisy. In Queen Mary's time he was, for his popish merits, preferred to be dean of Exeter, and was coadjutor to the bishop of that diocese (probably then superannuated), and died in that queen's reign. Besides these two, there was another clergyman the rebels spent another article in speaking for, namely, Cardinal Pole, whom they would have sent for home, and to be preferred to be of the privy council. But Cranmer told them his judgment; first, in general, of cardinals, that they never did good to this realm, but always hurt: and then in particular of this cardinal, that he had read once a virulent book of his writing against King Henry, exciting the Pope, the emperor, the French king, and all other princes, to invade this realm; and therefore that he was so far from deserving to be called home, and to live in England, that he deserved not to live at all. In fine, in this excellent composition of the archbishop, his design was, to expose the abuses and corruptions of Popery, and to convince the nation what need there was that such matters should be abolished, as the Pope's decrees, solitary masses, Latin service, hanging the host over the altar, sacrament in one kind, holy bread, and holy water, psalms, ashes, images, the old service-book, praying for souls in purgatory: and to vindicate the English service, the use of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and other matters relating to the Reformation, made in King Edward's time. Which he doth all along with that strain of happy perspicuity and easiness, that one shall scarcely meet with elsewhere, mixed everywhere with great gravity, seriousness, and compassion.

---

[1] No. XL.

The archbishop thought it highly convenient, in these commotions round about, to do his endeavours to keep those people, that were still and quiet as yet, in their duty. And for this purpose had sermons composed, to be now read by the curates to the people in their churches, to preserve them in their obedience, and to set out the evil and mischief of the present disturbances.[1] I find in the same volume where Cranmer's answers aforesaid are, a sermon against the seditions arising now everywhere, with the archbishop's interlinings, and marginal notes and corrections. This sermon was first wrote in Latin by Peter Martyr (as a note of Archbishop Parker's hand testifieth), at Archbishop Cranmer's request to the said learned man, no question; and so by his order translated into English, and printed, I suppose, for the common use in those times. It begins thus:

---

[1] Miscell. D. [C.C.C.C. MSS. No. 102, 409—499].

"The common sorrow of this present time, dear beloved brethren in Christ, if I should be more led thereby than by reason and zeal to my country, would move me rather to hold my peace than to speak: for the great evils which we now suffer are to be bewailed with tears and silence, rather than with words. And hereunto I might allege for me the example of Job, who, when he came to his extreme misery, he lying upon a dunghill, and three of his friends sitting upon the ground by him for the space of seven days, for great sorrow, not one of them opened his mouth to speak a word to another. If then the miserable estate of Job, like a most hard and sharp bit, stopped his mouth from speaking; and the lamentable case of their friend stayed these three men, being of speech most eloquent, that they could not utter their words; surely it seems that I have a much more cause to be still, and hold my peace. For there was the piteous lamentation of no more but one man, or one household, and that only concerning temporal and worldly substance; but we have cause to bewail a whole realm, and that most noble, which lately being in that state, that all other realms envied our wealth, and feared our force, is now so troubled, so vexed, so tossed and deformed, and that by sedition among ourselves, of such as be members of the same, that nothing is left unattempted to the utter ruin and subversion thereof: and besides this, the everlasting punishment of God threateneth as well the authors and procurers of these seditions, as all others that join themselves unto them," &c.

Besides this sermon of Peter Martyr's, there is another discourse penned by him under his own hand, on the same occasion, designed as it seems to be translated into English, and sent to the rebels; thus beginning:—

"Tantum voluit Deus vim charitatis et amoris magnitudinem, inter populum et magistratum intercedere, ut per Hieremiam admonuerit plebem Israeliticam, quod pro Rege Nebuchadnezzar orarent, qui eorum rempublicam everterat, illosque adhuc captivitate Babylonica premebat.

"Dominus tametsi voluit suos, instar columbarum, simplices degere, idem nihilominus admonuit, ut serpentum prudentiam imitarentur, qua suas actiones literarum sacrarum præceptis regerent et moderarentur, caverentque ne aliena consilia, ut papistarum vel seditiosorum, se in transversum auferrent.

"Si potuissetis (quod est prudentium), in longinquum prospicere, omnino vidissetis cæteros hostes (uti nunc res ipsa declarat), fretos vestris tumultibus in vestrum regnum arma sumpturos, et ausuros impune, qui nunquam, si in officio mansissetis, tentassent," &c.

This last paragraph respected the French king, who, taking occasion from these broils at home, brake out into open hostility against the kingdom, recalling his ambassador, and on a sudden brought his ships against the isles of Jersey and Guernsey, with an intent to have conquered them. But, by the valour of the inhabitants, and some of the king's ships, he was beaten off with great loss. This was in the month of August.

Martin Bucer also wrote a discourse against this sedition, as well as Martyr. Both of them were now, I suppose, under the archbishop's roof, entertained by him: and he thought it convenient that these learned foreigners should give some public testimony of their dislike of these doings. Bucer's discourse, subjoined to Martyr's, began in this tenor:—

"Quæ dici possunt ad sedandos animos plebis, et ab omni conatu seditioso absterrendos (quod ad rem ipsam attinet), inscripta sunt omnia, in reverendissimi D. N. M. Ven. Collegæ nostri Pet. Martyris Schedis, ut nostra adjectione nulla sit opus, tamen ut consensum spiritus testemur, hæc subjecta libuit annotare," &c.

An office of fasting was composed for this rebellion, which, being allayed in the west, grew more formidable in Norfolk and Yorkshire. For I find a prayer composed by the archbishop, with these words preceding:—"The Exhortation to Penance, or the Supplication, may end with this and some other-like prayer." And then the prayer followeth:—

"O Lord, whose goodness far exceedeth our naughtiness, and whose mercy passeth all measure, we confess Thy judgment to be most just, and that we worthily have deserved this rod wherewith Thou hast now beaten us. We have offended the Lord God; we have lived wickedly; we have gone out of the way; we have not heard Thy prophets, which Thou hast sent unto us, to teach us Thy word, nor have done as Thou hast commanded us; wherefore we be most worthy to suffer all these plagues. Thou hast done justly, and we be worthy to be confounded. But we provoke unto Thy goodness; we appeal unto Thy mercy; we humble ourselves; we knowledge our faults. We turn to thee, O Lord, with our whole hearts, in praying, in fasting, in lamenting and sorrowing for our offences. Have mercy upon us, cast us not away according to our deserts; but hear us, and deliver us with speed, and call us to Thee again, according to Thy mercy; that we, with one consent, and one mind, may evermore glorify Thee, world without end. Amen."

After this follow some rude draughts, written by Archbishop Cranmer's own hand, for the composing, as I suppose, of an homily, or homilies, to be used for the office aforesaid, which may be read in the Appendix.[1]

CHAPTER XI.

Bishop Bonner deprived.

On the eighth of September a commission was issued out from the king to our archbishop, together with Ridley, bishop of Rochester; Petre and Smith, the two secretaries, and Dr. May, dean of Paul's, to examine Bonner, bishop of London, for several matters of contempt of the king's order.[2]

---

[1] No. XLI.

[2] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments for a full narrative of these proceedings, vol. v. pp. 747, *et seq.*]

The witnesses against him were William Latimer and John Hooper. After the patience of seven sessions at Lambeth, in all which he carried himself disdainfully, making excuses and protestations, first against Sir Thomas Smith, and then against them all, and appealing to the king, the archbishop, in the name of the rest, declared him obstinate, and pronounced a sentence of deprivation against him, and committed him to the Marshalsea for his extraordinary rudeness to the king's commissioners; and there he abode all this king's reign. I will only mention somewhat of his behaviour towards the good archbishop.

At his first appearance before the commissioners, which was on the tenth of September, when they told him the reason of their commission, viz. "To call him to account for a sermon lately by him made at Paul's Cross; for that he did not publish to the people the article he was commanded to preach upon, that is, of the king's authority during his minority:" he, after a bold scoffing manner, gave no direct answer to this, but turned his speech to the archbishop, swearing, "That he wished one thing were had in more reverence than it was, namely, the blessed mass," as he styled it: and telling the archbishop withal, "That he had written very well of the sacrament, but he marvelled he did not more honour it." The archbishop, perceiving his gross ignorance concerning his book, by his commending that which was contrary to his opinion, said to Bonner, "That if he thought it well, it was because he understood it not." Bonner after his rude manner replied, "He thought he understood it better than he that wrote it." To which the archbishop subjoined, "That truly he would make a child of ten years old understand as much as he. But what is that," said he, "to our present matter?"

At this first session, when Bonner had said, "That he perceived the cause of his present trouble was, for that in the sermon made at Paul's Cross, before mentioned, he had asserted the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the altar;" the archbishop said, "That he spake much of a presence in the sacrament; but he asked him, What presence is there, and what presence he meant?" Bonner then in heat said, "My Lord, I say and believe, that there is the very true presence of the body and blood of

Christ. What, and how do you believe?" said he to the archbishop. Then the archbishop, not minding to answer his question at this time, asked him further, "Whether Christ were there, face, nose, mouth, eyes, arms, and lips, with other lineaments of His body?" At which Bonner shook his head, and said, "He was right sorry to hear his grace speak those words, and urged the archbishop to show his mind." But the archbishop wisely waived it, saying, "That their being there at that time was not to dispute of those matters, but to prosecute their commission against him."

At another of these sessions, staying at the chamber-door where the commissioners sat, perceiving some of the archbishop's gentlemen standing by, he applied himself to them, requiring and charging them, in God's behalf, and in His name, "That where they should chance to see and hear corrupt and erroneous preachers against the blessed sacrament of the altar, they should tell their lord and master of the same, and of these his sayings also to them, as they were Christian men, and should answer before God for the contrary." And being committed by the delegates to the under-marshal, and going away, he turned again, and told the archbishop, "That he was sorry that he, being a bishop, should be so handled at his hands; but more sorry that he suffered abominable heretics to practise as they did in London and elsewhere, infecting and disquieting the king's liege people. And therefore he required him, as he would answer to God and the king, that he would henceforth abstain thus to do. And if he did not," he said, "he would accuse him before God and the king's majesty. Answer to it," added he, "as well as you can." And so departed.

When Bonner, after the sentence of deprivation, made a solemn declaration there against their proceedings, saying, "That he came compelled, and not of his own free will, being brought as a prisoner;" and so appealed again from them to the king, the archbishop answered his declaration, and told him, "That whereas he said, he came coacted, or else he would not have appeared, he marvelled at him, for that he would thereby make them and the audience to believe, that because he was a prisoner, he ought not therefore to answer. Which if it were true, were enough to con-found the whole state of the realm: for I dare say," said the archbishop, "that of the greatest prisoners and rebels that ever the keeper there hath had under him, he cannot show me one that hath used such defence as you have here done." To which Bonner said, "That if his keeper were learned in the laws, he could show him his mind therein." The archbishop said, "That he had read over all the laws as well as he, but to another end and purpose than he did; and yet he could find no such privilege in this matter." He was deprived in the beginning of October, and the see remained void for some months till the next year, when Ridley was translated thither, as we shall see by-and-bye.

Indeed this was the most plausible pretence the Papists had, and which they made much use of (which Bonner and Gardiner had cunningly invented), viz. "That though the king were to be obeyed, and all were bound to submit to his laws, yet not to the orders and placits of his counsellors, who made what innovations they pleased in his name, and were none of his laws; and that therefore things should remain in the state wherein the former king left them, till the king, now a child, came to years of discretion to make laws himself." This the rebels in Devon made use of; and this also the Lady Mary urged very boldly to the lords of the council, for her incompliance with the communion-book, and for continuance of the use of the mass; telling them in a letter, "That she was resolved to remain obedient to her father's laws, till the king her brother should have perfect years of discretion to order that power that God had given him." Which letter, whereof I have the original, may be seen in the Appendix.[1] For the satisfying therefore of the people in this, the preachers were fain to do their endeavours in the pulpits; showing them that those that were in office under the king, were by the word of God to be obeyed as the king himself. "There be some men that say (as Latimer in one of his sermons in these days),[2] when the king's majesty himself commandeth me so to do, then I will do it, not afore. This is a wicked saying, and damnable; for we may not so be excused. Scripture is plain in it, and showeth us that we ought to obey his officers, having authority from the king, as well as unto the king himself. Therefore this excuse will not, nor cannot serve afore God. Yet let the magistrates take heed to their office and duty."

---

[1] No. XLII.

[2] Lat[imer's] Serm. fol. 25. [See Parker Society's edition, vol. i. p. 118.]

This year the archbishop celebrated a great ordination, consisting of such chiefly as showed themselves favourers of the king's proceedings, to be sent abroad to preach the Gospel, and to serve in the ministry of the Church. At this ordination Bishop Ridley also assisted the archbishop. The old Popish order of conferring of holy orders was yet in force, the new office as yet not being prepared and established: but this ordination nevertheless was celebrated after that order that was soon after established. At this ordination great favour was shown, and connivance to such who, otherwise being well qualified for piety and learning, scrupled wearing the habits used by the Popish priests. I meet with two famous men now ordained; the one was Robert Drakes, who was deacon to Dr. Taylor, parson of Hadley, at the commandment of Archbishop Cranmer, afterwards parson of Thundersley, in Essex, and in the year 1556 burnt to death in Smithfield for his constant profession ot Christ's religion. The other was Thomas Sampson, parson of Bread-street, London, and successively dean of Chichester and Christ's Church, Oxon; who in a letter of his, written to Secretary Cecil, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, said, "That at his ordination he excepted against the apparel; and by the archbishop, and Bishop Ridley, he was nevertheless permitted and admitted."

All the divine offices were now reformed, but only that for ordination of ministers. Therefore, for the doing of this, the council appointed twelve learned men, consisting half of bishops, and half of other inferior divines; whose names I do not meet with, excepting Hethe, bishop of Worcester; who, because he would not assist in this work, was sent to prison. The chief of them no doubt was the archbishop. After mature deliberation, this office was agreed upon, and finished; and Poinet was the first bishop consecrated after this new form. And that I suppose may be the reason, that it is set down at length in the Archbishop's Register in that manner as it is there to be seen; as we shall see under the next year.

Upon the vacancy of cathedral churches the archbishop used to visit. So now the church of St. David's being vacant, upon the remove of Barlow to Bath and Wells, the archbishop issued out a commission to Eliseus Price to visit that church. And upon the vacancy of Gloucester by the death of Wakeman, there was a commission to J. Williams, LL.D., and prebendary there, to be his commissary, and to visit that church, and to be keeper of the spiritualties of the city and diocese of Gloucester, in this third year of the king. This year also the church of Norwich being become vacant by the resignation of Repps, the archbishop granted a commission to John, bishop suffragan of Thetford, and dean of the church of the Holy Trinity, Norwich, to be his deputy and commissary for visitation and jurisdiction. But, somewhat before this, he constituted Roland Taylor, LL.D., and William Wakefeld, D.D., to be keepers of the spiritualties of Norwich; from whose jurisdiction he protested not to derogate by those his commissional letters to the suffragan, nor to withdraw from them any authority of jurisdiction. This was dated February 15. Also the church of London being vacant by the deprivation and destitution of Bonner, the archbishop constituted Gabriel Donne, residentiary of St. Paul's, to be his official, and keeper of the spiritualties, to exercise all manner of episcopal jurisdiction in the said city and diocese.

This year he made Griffin Leyson, LL.D., dean of the Arches.

CHAPTER XII.

Duke of Somerset's Troubles. The Common Prayer ratified.

When most of the council had combined together, in the month of October, against the protector of the king's person, the duke of Somerset, and had withdrawn themselves to Ely House, the king then being at Hampton Court, and suddenly conveyed by the said duke to Windsor, upon the fear of tumult; then I find the archbishop, and but two privy counsellors more, with the king and the protector there. Being here, the good archbishop, though he would not forsake his friend the duke, nor the king his master, yet he did what lay in him to appease and pacify these heats. And so he, with the Lord Paget and Secretary Smith, in their own and the king's name, wrote an earnest letter to the separating counsellors, and sent it by Sir Philip Hoby: wherein, as appears by their answer, "they were charged by the archbishop with creating much care and sorrow to the king, and that he thought they had not that care that beseemed them of pacifying the present uproars, and for the preservation of the state from danger: that they forgat the benefits they had received from the king's father, nor were mindful of their duty of allegiance: that their doings bespake wilfulness; and that the Protector meant nothing but the safety and protection of the king in what he had done; and that he had that consideration of his duty to God, that the promise and oath he made required." They were advised to do as they would be done unto: and mention was made of cruelty more than once, charging them obliquely therewith. And in fine he wrote, that he, and those with him, knew more than they did, to whom they writ. Probably he meant that he knew that this anger against the duke arose from the private malice of some of them, or their hatred of the Reformation, notwithstanding all the fair pretences of their care of the king, and the Protector's misgovernment.

This letter the lords from Ely House answered, charging and commanding the archbishop, and those with him, to have a continual earnest watch of the king's person, and that he be not removed from Windsor Castle, as they would answer the same at their utmost perils. They wondered much, they said, that they would suffer the king's royal person to remain in the guard of the duke's men, and that strangers should be armed with the king's armour, and be nearest about his person: for it seems many of the king's servants, in this fear, were removed away. They advised the archbishop and the Lord Paget to come over to their side, and to leave the poor duke alone. Upon this the archbishop and the others wrote a second letter, dated October the 10th; wherein they assured the lords, that they could, whensoever they pleased to require it, give such very good reasons for their so often mentioning cruelty in their other letter, as, they questioned not, they would be well satisfied with. And so, upon the lords' propounding a meeting with the king and them, they accorded thereunto, in great prudence, willing, for peace and quietness in that dangerous time, so to do. These letters are recorded in the History of the Reformation.[1]

The Common Prayer Book, and Administration of the Sacraments, by the great care and study of the archbishop, was now finished, and settled by Act of Parliament;[2] which would not down with a great many. But upon the taking up of the duke of Somerset in the month of October, and laying him in the Tower, it was generally said that now the old Latin service should come in again, the common opinion being, that the Common Prayer was peculiarly of his procuring. And that there were such designs among Somerset's enemies, who were generally favourers of the old religion, it is not improbable. The good archbishop thought it now time to interpose in this thing, and to obtain from the privy council somewhat to confirm the book of Common Prayer. So there was, in December 25, a general letter drawn up to all the bishops of England, letting them understand, "That there was no intention of bringing in again Latin service, conjured bread and water, nor any such abrogated ceremonies; and that the abolishing of these, and the setting forth of the book of Common Prayer, was done by the whole state of the realm. That the book was grounded upon the Holy Scripture, and was agreeable to the order of the primitive church, and much to the edifying of the subject; and therefore that the changing of that for the old Latin service would be a preferring of ignorance to knowledge, darkness to light, and a preparation to bring in papistry and superstition again. The bishops therefore were bid with all speed to command their deans and prebendaries, and all parsons, vicars, and curates, to bring to such places as the bishops should appoint, all antiphoners, missals, &c., and all other books of service; and that they be defaced and abolished, that they be no let to that godly and uniform order set forth. And to commit to ward any stubborn and disobedient persons that brought not the said books, and to certify the council of their misbehaviour. That they should make search, if any of these superstitious books were withdrawn or hid. That whereas there were some persons, who refused to contribute to the buying of bread and wine for the communion, according to the order of the book, whereby many times the holy communion was fain to be omitted; to convent such persons before them, and admonish them; and if they refused to do accordingly, to punish them by suspension, excommunication, or other censure." This was signed by the archbishop and the Lord Chancellor Rich, and four more.

---

[1] Vol. ii. Collect. pp. 187, 188 [vol. ii. part 2, book i. Nos. 43, 44, pp. 263—268].

[2] [This "Act of Parliament" was 1st and 3rd Edward VI. c. 1, and was intituled, "An Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm."]

CHAPTER XIII.

The Archbishop entertains learned Foreigners.

THE archbishop had now in his family several learned men. Some he sent for from beyond sea, and some in pity he entertained, being exiles for religion. Among the former sort was Martin Bucer, a man of great learning and moderation, and who bore a great part in the Reformation of Germany. While he and the rest abode under his roof, the archbishop still employed them, sometimes in learned conferences and consultations held with them, sometimes in writing their judgment upon some subjects in divinity. Here Bucer wrote to the Lady Elizabeth a letter, bearing date the 6th of the Calends of September, commending her study in piety and learning, and exciting her to proceed therein; incited so to do, I make no doubt, by the archbishop, whom Bucer in that letter makes mention of, and styleth, "Patrem suum, et benignissimum hospitem."[1] Hence also he wrote another letter to the marquis of Northampton (who was a patron of learning, and a professor of religion), in the behalf of Sleidan, who was promised a pension by the king, to enable him to write the history of the progress of religion, beginning at Luther. A part of the letter, translated into English, ran thus:—

---

[1] MSS. C.C.C.C. Miscellan. A. [No. 113, 4. See Eccl. Hist. Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 140, note [i]].

"Therefore, if we should not take care that this so great act of divine goodness towards us [viz. the Reformation, begun in the year 1517] should be most diligently written and consecrated to posterity, we should lie under the crime of the neglect of God's glory, and most foul ingratitude. Therefore John Sleidan, a very learned and eloquent man, five years ago began to compile an history of this nature, as the work he had published did witness; but after he was much encouraged in this undertaking, and well furnished with matter, the calamities that befell Germany, for our own deserts, intercepted the pious attempts of this man, so very useful to the Church. Nor doth it appear now from whence, besides the king's majesty, we may hope that some small benignity may be obtained for Sleidan; since the salaries, which he received for this purpose from the German princes, failed; and he was poor. That John Alasco, Dr. Peter Martyr, and he, considering these things, and weighing how the truly Christian King Edward was even born with a desire of illustrating the glory of Christ, and what need there was to set Sleidan again upon finishing the History of the Gospel restored to us; they had therefore presumed to supplicate the king in his behalf, and entreated the marquis to promote and forward their supplication, and to vouchsafe to contribute his helpalso." We shall hear more of this hereafter.

I find also annotations writ by the said Bucer upon St. Matthew, reaching as far as the eighth chapter, and there ending, in this method: There is the Latin translation, with large notes added in the margin; and at the end of each chapter common places collected from thence in the nature of inferences and observations; which I conclude the archbishop put him upon doing while he was now with him.[1] The work was looked over and examined by the archbishop, notes and corrections of his own hand being here and there inserted. Also the Gospel of St. Mark is handled in the same method, by another of the archbishop's guests; which writing hath this inscription by Cranmer's hand: "Petrus Alexander in Marcum."

---

[1] MSS. C.C.C.C. Miscellan. D. [No. 104, 1. See Eccl. Hist. Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 142, note [1]].

At this time, therefore, there were at the archbishop's house (besides Bucer), Alasco, Peter Martyr, Paulus Fagius, Peter Alexander, Bernardine Ochin, Mat. Negelinus (after a minister of Strasburg), who accompanied Bucer and Fagius into England, and others, whose names do not occur. Three of these were soon after preferred to public places of reading in the universities. Peter Alexander was of Artois, and lived with the archbishop before Bucer came into England. He was a learned man, but had different sentiments in the matter of the Eucharist, inclining to the belief of a corporeal presence with the Lutherans: though some years after he came over to a righter judgment, as his companion Peter Martyr signified to Calvin, in a letter wrote from Strasburg.[1]

Peter Martyr coming, about the beginning of the year 1549, unto the university of Oxford, his first readings were upon the eleventh chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians; in which chapter is some discourse of the Lord's Supper. The professor, when he came so far, took occasion to expatiate more largely upon that argument; and the rather that he might state it aright in the midst of those hot contests that were then about it among learned men. These lectures on the sacrament he soon after printed at London, for the benefit of the world (as they were two years after done at Zurich), and dedicated them to his patron the archbishop. And that partly to give a public testimony of his sense of the archbishop's great humanity and benefits towards him, "which were so large that he must do nothing else but tell of them to be sufficiently thankful for them. And known it was to all," as he said, "how obligingly he received, and how liberally he entertained both himself and many other strangers of his rank and condition. And partly that by his authority he would protect and defend what he should find in his book to be consonant to the holy Scriptures, and agreeable to the king's laws. For he had," he said, "skill and industry enough to do it;

---

[1] Calvin, Ep. 197.

who had himself often, both in public and private, conflicted with the adversaries, and with admirable learning, accuracy of wit, and dexterity, vindicated the truth from the spinous and confused cavils of sophisters. Nor did he want will to stand up for sound and Christian doctrines, as all good men knew; who saw how earnest he was in his labours of restoring religion; that for that cause he drew upon himself many enmities and threatening dangers."

The first occasion of Bucer's call into England was thus. He had wrote to John Hales (a learned Englishman, his acquaintance), the sad estate of Germany, and that he could scarce stay any longer in the place where he was. This Hales acquainted the archbishop with, which made a great impression upon his compassionate soul, and he brake out into those words of the psalmist, "Mirifica misericordias tuas, qui salvos facis sperantes in te a resistentibus dexteræ tuæ." And forthwith writ to Bucer a letter in October 1548, to come over to this realm, which should be a most safe harbour for him, urging him to become a labourer in the Lord's harvest here begun; and using other arguments with him to move him hereunto, in the most obliging style possible, calling him "My Bucer." And that he might come over the safer from harms and enemies, the archbishop recommended him to one Hills, an English merchant, to provide for his passage. The archbishop's letter may be found in the Appendix.[1] To this letter Bucer wrote an answer, seeming, upon considerations, to decline the archbishop's invitation. This letter coming to the archbishop's hands, he showed to Peter Alexander, who, by the archbishop's order, wrote back to Bucer, in the said archbishop's and the protector's name, to call him again over; which letter was dated March 24, from Lambeth; telling him withal, that the good old man Latimer saluted him. Letters, I suppose of the same import, were also despatched to the learned Fagius.

Bucer and Fagius, who were thus honourably invited into England by repeated letters of the lord protector and Archbishop Cranmer, were by them also nominated for public professors in the university of Cambridge, the one of divinity, the other of the Hebrew tongue. This was looked on by their friends as a notable piece of God's good providence, that when these two eminent champions of the true religion were in so much present danger in Germany, so seasonable a refuge was provided for them elsewhere.[1] They both arrived safe in England in the end of April, and abode with the archbishop above a quarter of a year, until towards the end of the long vacation, the archbishop intending they should be at Cambridge when the term should begin, in order to their reading. During this interval, while they continued at Lambeth, they were not idle, being every day busied in some study and exercise agreeable to their function, as was hinted before. But the main of their thoughts were taken up in preparing for their university lectures, which, of what subject-matter they should be, the archbishop himself directed. As it had been a great while his pious and most earnest desire, that the holy Bible should come abroad in the greatest exactness, and true agreement with the original text, so he laid this work upon these two learned men. First, that they should give a clear, plain, and succinct interpretation of the Scripture, according to the propriety of the language. And secondly, illustrate difficult and obscure places, and reconcile those that seemed repugnant to one another. And it was his will and his advice, that to this end and purpose their public readings should tend. This pious and good work, by the archbishop assigned to them, they most gladly and readily undertook. For their more regular carrying on this business, they allotted to each other, by consent, their distinct tasks. Fagius, because his talent lay in the Hebrew learning, was to undertake the Old Testament; and Bucer the New. The leisure they now enjoyed with the archbishop, they spent in preparing their respective lectures. Fagius entered upon the evangelical Prophet Esaias, and Bucer upon the Gospel of the Evangelist John; and some chapters in each book were despatched by them. But it was not long but both of them fell sick, which gave a very unhappy stop to their studies.

---

[1] No. XLIII.

Fagius' distemper proved mortal, who was seized at first with a very acute fever. And notwithstanding physic and attendance, remaining very ill, he had a great desire to remove to Cambridge to his charge appointed him, hoping the change of air might help him. He made a shift to travel thither, leaving his dear colleague sick behind him. But Fagius still declining in his health, ardently desired Bucer's company, who on the fifth of November came to Cambridge; and ten days after Fagius deceased, aged about forty-five years, to the extraordinary loss of that university, and the grief of all pious men that wished well to religion: and, which was most to be lamented, before he had given any specimen of his learning and abilities in England; though he had already given many to the world; all showing what a master he was in Hebrew and Rabbinical learning. His published labours of this nature (all within the space of six years), may be seen in the Appendix;[1] which I have placed there for the preserving the memory of that learned professor, which our university of Cambridge was once honoured with.

---

[1] Vit. P. Fag. per Ministr. aliquos Eccles. Argent.

The good archbishop, troubled at the sudden death of this learned man, from whom he had promised himself some great good to accrue to the university, sent a letter, November the last, unto his sorrowful companion Bucer, desiring him, among other things, as from him, to comfort Fagius' widow, and to let her know that he had sent her by the carrier seven and twenty pounds, which was part of the stipend due out of the exchequer to her husband, which, although it were not yet paid into Cranmer's hands, yet he thought good to send her the money so soon, that it might be some alleviation of her present sorrow. There were fifty pounds due for his readings, reckoning from Lady-day last, when his pension began; but three pounds were disbursed for charges in taking out the patent, and twenty pounds the archbishop had sent him before.

Bucer above all lamented the loss of his mate, and wrote a sorrowful letter *ad fratres et symmystas*, to his brethren and fellow-ministers in Germany, upon this subject. And in a letter to P. Martyr, then at Oxon, he not only complained of this heavy loss, but, as if himself were like to follow him, of several things that made him uneasy at Cambridge, where he was now placed; as of the want of a convenient house, of a body impatient of cold, which the time of the year made him begin to feel, need of necessaries: that the letters patents were not yet signed [for his salary], and the slow and uncertain payment of his pension. But Cranmer, out of that high respect he had for him, was not wanting in his diligence in due time to make all easy to him, and to have so useful and grave a man well provided for. But the next year, the last day of February, Bucer followed his companion to the other world; but not before he had made himself and his learning known to the university, which, to qualify him to moderate at the public disputations at the commencement, had given him the degree of doctor, as a peculiar honour done him, without the common rites and forms ordinarily used in those cases. Yet he chose to do his exercises, responding the first day of the commencement, and opposing the second, with great learning, and no less satisfaction of the university.

---

[1] No. XLIV.

CHAPTER XIV.

Peter Martyr disputes in Oxford, being challenged thereunto.

THE Papists in both universities were resolved to try the metal and learning of their new professors; being exceedingly nettled at their coming, and offended at their readings.

Those of P. Martyr at Oxon highly provoked many in that university, that could not endure to hear the old error of the corporeal presence opposed. And of such there were not a few, and especially the heads of the colleges; the elder sort being more stiff and prejudiced to their old ways and opinions. This doctrine of the sacrament was first obscured, and afterwards depraved: and so this error being entertained, became a door for the letting in a flood of superstition and idolatry into the Church.[1] This Martyr well knew, and therefore with wonderful pains endeavoured to vindicate the truth of the Eucharist from error and corruption. And this procured him many enemies here. For they could not endure him, and first raised up among the people slanders against him, as though he impugned the doctrine of the ancients, and shook the laudable ceremonies of the Church, and profaned the sacrament of the altar, and in effect trampled it under his feet. And this noise being a little stilled, not long after, the day before he was to read publicly, they set up bills in English upon all the doors of the churches, that on such a day there should be a public disputation about the presence of Christ in the sacrament, Martyr knowing nothing of it, though he was designed to be the disputant. The day being come, the schools were filled with great numbers of such who favoured the Papists: and these were instructed to be ready to make loud clamours and tumults, and to proceed to blows, if need were. The students also and the townsmen flocked together at the noise of this dispute, to see the event, and to make a party, according as they stood affected. When the day was come, notwithstanding his friends persuaded him not to adventure himself to read that day, lest he might incur some danger, he went and did his duty. For he said, "he would not be wanting to his office, nor neglect the place the king had intrusted him with; and that there were many, that came questionless to hear his lectures, whom he would not disappoint." As he, with his friends accompanying him, went to his reading, a servant of Richard Smith, D.D., whom we have before spoke of, the chief in this plot, met him, and delivered him a letter from his master, wherein he challenged him to a dispute that day.

---

[1] Vit. Mart. per Simler.

Being come to the chair, he gently told his adversaries, in a modest speech to them, "that he refused not to dispute, but that at that time he came to read, and not to dispute." And so themselves yielding to it, he proceeded to his lecture, which he performed with much constancy and undauntedness, without the least disturbance of mind, or change of countenance or colour, or hesitation in his speech, notwithstanding the murmur and noise of the adversaries; which got him much credit and applause.

As soon as he had done his reading, the adversaries began to make loud cries that he should dispute, and especially Smith the champion. But he modestly refused it, and said, "he would do it at another time, and that he was not then prepared, because they had so studiously concealed the propositions to be disputed of, and had not propounded them publicly, according to the accustomed manner; and that he knew nothing of them till that very day." But they told him, "he could not be unprepared, who had read so much of the Lord's supper, whatsoever arguments they propounded in this matter." They still rudely urging him; he said, "he would do nothing in such a matter, without the king were first made privy to it, especially when the thing tended to sedition. Moreover, for a lawful disputation, it was requisite," he said, "that certain questions be propounded, judges and moderators constituted, and public notaries be present, that might impartially and faithfully write down the arguments and speeches on both sides."

In fine, the matter came to that pass, that, fearing a tumult, the vice-chancellor decided the controversy after this manner: "That both P. Martyr and Smith, with some friends, should meet in his house, and should appoint the propositions to be disputed of, the time, the order and manner of disputation." And so the vice-chancellor, the beadle making him way, went to the pulpit where the professor was, and took him by the hand, and led him down through the crowds to his own house, his friends going along with him; and among the rest Sidal and Curtop, then vigorous defenders of the truth; but after, in Queen Mary's days, revolting. Smith also, and his friends Cole, Oglethorp, and three more, repaired to the vice-chancellor, where it was agreed, after some jangling, that Martyr should observe the same order in confuting as he did in teaching; and abstaining from strange, barbarous, and ambiguous words, wont to be used in the schools, he said he would use only *carnaliter* and *corporaliter*, *realiter* and *substantialiter*, because the Scripture useth only the words *flesh* and *body*, *res* or *substantia*. And so it was agreed; and the day set was the fourth of May ensuing. And it was agreed also on both sides, that all this whole matter should be signified to the council, that they might have cognizance of the thing. And by them the day of the disputation was appointed, when some from the king, as judges and keepers of peace, would be present at it. The Papists reported falsely that he, having appointed the time of the disputation to be ten days hence; in the mean time got the magistrates acquainted with this affair, that they might stop and forbid it, which they did indeed, proroguing it till some months after the first challenge. And that afterwards, when the professor saw his opportunity, he provoked to a public disputation, offering to dispute of his questions formerly propounded, and thought there would be none to take him up. For Smith, they say, smelt out some crafty device taken against him, and so appeared not at the dispute. And then indeed few thought convenient to be there, their plot of making a rout and confusion being spoiled. Indeed Smith, conscious to himself of making this tumult, fled before the day came, and went into Scotland. But Dr. Tresham, a zealous man, that this cause might not fall, was desirous to undertake the disputation; and did so, with Dr. Chedsey and Mr. Morgan, before the king's visitors, who were Henry [Holbeach], bishop of Lincoln; Dr. Cox, chancellor of that university; Dr. Simon Haines, dean of Exeter; Richard Morison, esquire; Christopher Nevison, doctor of civil law. Before these honourable umpires, who came with the king's letters patent, the disputation concerning transubstantiation, and the carnal presence in the sacrament, lasted four days; wherein P. Martyr the respondent did acquit himself very sufficiently, both from Scripture and [the] Fathers. The sum of which may be seen in Fox's Monuments, and the whole in Martyr's works, in that part thereof intituled "De Eucharistia Disputatio."[1]

The first day of the disputation was May the 28th: it was managed between Martyr and Tresham. Dr. Cox, the chancellor, began with a speech. Then Martyr made his prooemial oration and prayer. Then Tresham succeeded with another oration, bestowing some praises upon Martyr, which he replying upon, and briefly and modestly declining, began his argument. The next disputation, on May 29, was between Martyr and Chedsey, after Martyr had made a short speech and prayer, and Chedsey his preface. The third action was between Morgan, Tresham, and Martyr. The disputation of the fourth day, June 1, was again between Chedsey and Martyr. And then all was concluded by another speech uttered by the said chancellor. Wherein he had these words: "Peter—and a Peter indeed for his steady constancy—Martyr—and rightly called Martyr, for the numberless testimonies by him produced in the behalf of truth—must needs obtain much favour and respect from us, and all good men; First, that he hath taken such vast pains in standing under even a burden of disputations. For if 'not Hercules himself against two,' what shall we think of Peter alone against all? Secondly, that he hath undertook the challenge of a disputation, and so stopped the vain speeches of vain men, who dispersed envious and odious insinuations concerning him; as that either he would not, or dared not, to maintain his own tenets; and, lastly, that he hath so excellently well answered the expectation of the chief magistrates, and so of the king himself; while he hath not only recommended to the university the doctrine of Christ from God's lively fountains, but also hath not permitted any, as much as lay in him, to muddy or obstruct them." But I refer the reader for the rest to Dr. Cox's own oration.[1]

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 297, *et seq.* Also Simler, de Vita et Obitu P. Martyr. pp. 14, 15.]

The professor drew up the whole four days' disputation soon after, and sent it, by his constant friend and companion Julius, to his patron the archbishop. And with the same messenger he conveyed a letter, dated June 15, to Bucer, then at the archbishop's house, concerning his said disputation. Therein he signified the obstinacy and boldness of his opponents; and that he feared, "That his doctrines he then maintained might not altogether square with Bucer's judgment. But he said in his own justification, that he granted the body of Christ was present to us by faith, and that we are incorporated into Him by communication. He confessed here, that we do partake of the matter of the sacrament, namely, the body and blood of Christ; but he meant it in mind and faith. And in the mean time he granted, that the Holy Ghost is efficacious in the sacraments, by virtue of the Lord's institution. But that which he especially endeavoured to assert was, that they mixed not the body and blood of Christ carnally with the bread and wine, by any corporeal presence. Nor yet would he have the sacrament to be symbols without honour and reverence. Another thing he asserted, which he thought might offend Bucer, was, that it was not agreeable to the body of Christ, however glorified, to be in many places at once. But for this, he wrote Bucer, as he urged in the disputation, that the Scripture obliged to no such belief; how the reason of an human body reclaimed against it; and the fathers affirmed that such a quality was granted to no creature, but belonged to God alone." And so, inviting him, and Fagius and Alexander, to Oxford, concluded his letter.

---

[1] [No. XLIV.]

But when the Papists dispersed vain stories and many falsehoods concerning this business, he was forced, his friends also urging him thereunto, to publish an account hereof. And with what fidelity and diligence he drew up his book, the testimonies of two of the king's counsellors, ear-witnesses, added thereto, sufficiently confirmed. In the preface to his relation of these disputes, he assigned two reasons that made him publish them. The one was, the calumnies of evil men; the other, the desires of his friends. Under the former he complained, "how he was by his adversaries bespattered among all sorts of people, princes, nobles, commons, citizens, clowns; and that all corners, streets, houses, shops, taverns, sounded their triumphs over him; and he doubted not, that it was dispersed by them into other nations. Upon these considerations, his great patron, the archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he dared to deny nothing,[1] and the king's visitors, besides others of his friends, had advised and desired him to put forth these his disputations in his own vindication, and in the vindication of the truth. These he professed to write with all fidelity; and, that he might be the more exact, he had compared his own collections with the relations that were drawn up by the adversaries; and that, having read theirs, what he could recall that he had before omitted, which was of any moment, he restored out of their writings."

But Tresham, the chief disputant, pretending himself aggrieved with this book, as though Martyr had therein misrepresented him, and expressed some indignation against him, and added some things that were not spoken, wrote himself another account of this disputation, in justification of himself against the professor, and set a preface before it, by way of epistle, to the king's privy council. Wherein he most angrily bespattered this reverend man, calling him "*Pseudo-Martyr*, a doting old man, subverted, impudent, and the famous master of errors; and that he fled into Germany to obtain the more license for his lust, and that he might enjoy his adultery," meaning his wife. The disputation itself is too long to be transcribed; it is extant among the Foxian manuscripts.[1] But the epistle dedicatory, or preface before it,[2] I will not omit, that the reader may there observe the malicious spirit of Martyr's adversaries, and collect some further account of this disputation. But the reader must remember, that it was an angry antagonist that wrote it.

---

[1] "Quid enim negare ausim rever[endissimo] Archiepiscopo Cant[uariensi,] cui plane omnia debeo?" In Præfat. ad Disp.

Dr. Smith, who had done his best to cause a riot in the university, and thereby to endanger the king's professor, and was therefore got away into Scotland—conscious likewise to himself of calumnies and wrongs done by him against the archbishop—some time after wrote to the archbishop a submissive letter, praying him "to forgive all the injuries he had done his grace, and to obtain the king's pardon for him, that he might return home again. And he promised to write a book for the marriage of priests, as he had done before against it. That he was the more desirous to come home into England, because otherwise he should be put upon writing against his grace's book of the sacrament, and all his proceedings in religion, being then harboured," as he would make it believed, "by such as required it at his hands."[3] But in Queen Mary's days he revolted again, and was a most zealous Papist, and then did that indeed, which he gave some hints of before; for he wrote vehemently against Cranmer's book.

But from Oxford, let us look over to Cambridge,[4] where disputations likewise were held in the month of June, before the king's commissioners, who were Ridley bishop of Rochester, Thomas [Goodrich] bishop of Ely, Mr. Cheke, Dr. May, and Dr. Wendy, the king's physician. The questions were,

---

[1] No. XLV.

[2] [Harl. MSS. ccccxxii. 4—30].

[3] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 469.]

[4] [Id. vol. vi. pp. 305, *et seq.*]

"That transubstantiation could not be proved by Scripture, nor be confirmed by the consent of ancient fathers for a thousand years past. And that the Lord's supper is no oblation or sacrifice, otherwise than a remembrance of Christ's death." There were three solemn disputations. In the first, Dr. Madew was respondent; and Glyn, Langdale, Sedgwick, and Young, opponents. In the second, Dr. Glyn was respondent on the Popish side; opponents, Perne, Grindal, Guest, Pilkington. In the third, Dr. Perne was respondent; Parker, Pollard, Vavasor, Young, opponents. After these disputations were ended, the bishop of Rochester determined the truth of these questions[1] *ad placitum suum*, as a Papist wrote, out of whose notes I transcribe the names of these disputants.

Besides these disputations, when Bucer came to Cambridge, he was engaged in another with Sedgwick, Perne, and Young, upon these questions:—'1. That the canonical books of Scripture alone do teach sufficiently all things necessary to salvation. 2. That there is no church in earth that erreth not, as well in faith as manners. 3. That we are so freely justified of God, that, before our justification, whatsoever good works we seem to do have the nature of sin."[2] Concerning this last, he and Young had several combats, which are set down in his English works.

As to Bucer's opinion of the presence in the sacrament, the great controversy of this time, it may not be amiss to consider what so great a professor thought herein; and especially by what we saw before, that Martyr and he did somewhat differ in this point; for as he would not admit those words *carnally* and *naturally*, so neither did he like *realiter* and *substantialiter*. Bucer's judgment, drawn up by himself sententiously in fifty-four aphorisms, may be seen in the Appendix,[3] as I meet with it among Fox's papers. It is extant in Latin among his *Scripta Anglicana*, and entitled, "Concessio D. M. Buc. de Sancta Eucharistia, in Anglia Aphoristicos scripta, Anno 1550." And so we take our leave of Bucer for this year. We shall hear of him again in the next.

---

[1] [This determination of Bishop Ridley is given by Fox, Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. pp. 332—335.]

[2] [Id. vol. vi. p. 335.]

[3] No. XLVI.

CHAPTER XV.

Matters of the Church, and its State now.

Let me now crave a little room to set down some matters that relate to the Church, coming within the compass of this year, which will show what mean advances religion as yet had made in the nation.

Divers relics of Popery still continued in the nation, by means partly of the bishops, partly of the justices of peace, popishly affected. In London Bishop Bonner drove on but heavily in the king's proceedings, though he outwardly complied. In his cathedral church there remained still the Apostles' mass, and our Lady's mass, and other masses under the defence and nomination of our Lady's communion, used in the private chapels, and other remote places of the same church, though not in the chancel; contrary to the king's proceedings. Therefore the Lord Protector, and others of the council, wrote to the bishop,[1] June 24, complaining of this, and ordering that no such masses should be used in St. Paul's church any longer; and that the holy communion, according to the Act of Parliament, should be ministered at the high altar of the church, and in no other place of the same, and only at such times as the high masses were wont to be used; except some number of people, for their necessary business, desired to have a communion in the morning; and yet the same to be exercised in the chancel at the high altar, as was appointed in the book of Public Service. Accordingly Bonner directed his letters to the dean and chapter of Paul's, to call together those that were resident, and to declare these matters.

As it was thus in London, so in the counties, too many of the justices were slack in seeing to the execution of the king's laws, relating not only to religion, but to other affairs. And in some shires that were further distant, the people had never so much as heard of the king's proclamation, by the default of the justices, who winked at the people's neglect thereof. For the quickening of the justices of peace at this time, when a foreign invasion was daily expected, and foreign power was come into Scotland to aid that nation against England, the Lord Protector and the privy council assembled at the Star Chamber, and called before them all the justices, which was a thing accustomed sometimes to be done, for the justices to appear before the king and council, there to have admonitions and warnings given them for the discharge of their duty. And then the Lord Chancellor Rich made a speech to them, "That they should repair down into their several countries with speed, and give warning to other gentlemen to go down to their houses, and there to see good order and rule kept, that their sessions of gaol delivery, and quarter sessions be well observed, that vagabonds and seditious talebearers of the king or his council, and such as preached without license, be repressed and punished. That if there should be any uproars, or routs, and riots of lewd fellows, or privy traitors, they should appease them. And that if any enemy should chance to arise in any place of England, they should fire the beacons, as had been wrote to them before, and repulse the same in as good array as they could. And that for that purpose they should see diligently that men have horse, harness, and other furniture of weapon ready."

---

[1] Fox's Acts, [vol. v. p. 723].

And to the bishops the council now sent letters again for redress of the contempt and neglect of the Book of Common Prayer, which to this time, long after the publishing thereof, was either not known at all to many, or very irreverently used: occasioned especially by the winking of the bishops, and the stubborn disobedience of old Popish curates. The letter is dated the 23rd of July, and is extant in Fox.[1]

In London, by the connivance and remissness of the bishop, many neglected the divine service then established, and others did in secret places of the diocese often frequent the Popish mass, and other superstitious rites, not allowed by the laws of England. The sins of adultery greatly increased. The churches, and particularly the mother-church of St. Paul's, ran into dilapidations; the glass was broken, and the ornaments and other buildings belonging to churches neglected. Many refused to pay tithes to their curates, probably of both sorts; such as were Papists, to those curates as more diligently preached reformation, and obeyed the king's laws; and such as were not so, to such curates as were more backward thereunto. Bishop Bonner also himself now seldom came to church, seldomer preached and celebrated the English communion. Wherefore the council sent certain private injunctions to Bonner for the redress of these things; "That he should preach in his own person at Paul's Cross, and declare certain articles relating to the beforementioned neglects, which the council now sent to him to redress. That he should preach once in a quarter, and exhort the people to obedience, and that he should be present at every sermon at Paul's Cross. That he should on the principal feasts celebrate the communion, and at all times that his predecessors used to celebrate and sing high mass. That he should call before him all such as did not frequent the church and common prayer, and the holy communion, and punish them, as also adulterers; and that he should look to the reparation of St. Paul's and other churches, and that the people pay their tithes."

---

[1] **[Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 726.]**

The adulteries before hinted, which the council thought fit to recommend to the bishop to take particular cognizance of, make me add, that about this time the nation grew infamous for this crime. It began among the nobility, and so spread at length among the inferior sort. Noblemen would very frequently put away their wives and marry others, if they liked another woman better, or were like to obtain wealth by her. And they would sometimes pretend their former wives to be false to their beds, and so be divorced, and marry again such whom they fancied. The first occasion of this seemed to be in the earl of Northampton divorcing himself from his first wife Anne, daughter to the earl of Essex, and after marrying Elizabeth, daughter to the Lord Cobham. In like manner Henry, son of William, earl of Pembroke, put away Katharine, daughter to Henry, the duke of Suffolk, and married Mary, the daughter of Sir Henry Sidney. These adulteries and divorces increased much; yea, and marrying again without divorce, which became a great scandal to the realm, and to the religion professed in it, and gave much sorrow and trouble in good men to see it; insomuch that they thought it necessary to move for an Act of Parliament to punish adultery with death. This Latimer, in a sermon preached in the year 1550, signified to the king: "For the love of God," saith he, "take an order for marriage here in England."[1]

This is some account of the retardation of religion. On the other hand, the endeavours of those that wished well to it were not wanting. Now the Protestants began more freely to put forth books, and to disperse such as were formerly printed beyond sea, in the behalf of religion against Popery, and concerning such as had suffered under the cruelties of the church of Rome. Bale about these days dispersed his books. One was "The Image of both Churches," applying the divine prophecy of the Revelations to the apostate church of Rome. Another was a vindication of the Lady Anne Askew, who suffered the cruel death of burning about the end of King Henry's reign, whose cause the Papists studiously had rendered bad. This book he entitled, "The Elucidation of Anne Askew's Martyrdom," which was this year exposed publicly to sale at Winchester, and the parts thereabouts, as a reproach to [Gardiner] the bishop of Winchester, who was the great cause of her death. Four of these books came to that bishop's own eyes, being then at Winchester; they had leaves put in as additions to the book, some glued and some unglued; which probably contained some further intelligences that the author had gathered since his first writing of the book. And herein some reflections were made freely, according to Bale's talent, upon some of the court, not sparing Paget himself, though then secretary of state. Another of Bale's books, that went now about, was touching the death of Luther. Therein was a prayer of the duke of Saxony mentioned, which the bishop of Winchester gladly took hold on; wherein that duke, as to the justness of his cause, remitted "himself to God's judgment to be showed on him here in this world, if the cause he undertook were not just concerning religion; and desired God, if it were not good, to order him to be taken and spoiled of his honours and possessions." Since which the duke was taken prisoner; and, at the very time of his taking, the Papists made an observation, that the sun appeared so strangely in England as the like had not been seen before. So apt are men to interpret events according to their own preconceived opinions. But at this Winchester took much advantage. Whereas indeed the issues of God's providence in this world are not favourable always even to the best causes.

---

[1] [See Parker Society's edition of Bishop Latimer's Works, vol. i. p. 243.]

The keeping of Lent was now called into controversy, and asserted, that it was not to be observed upon a religious account. And this was done the rather, because the Papists placed so much religion in the bare fast. In the pulpit it began to be cried down. Tongue and Joseph, two great preachers in London, said, "That Lent was one of Christ's miracles, which God ordained not men to imitate or follow; and that it was an insupportable burden." There was a set of rhymes now made about the burial of Lent, which was called, "Jack of Lent's Testament," and publicly sold in Winchester market: therein Stephen Gardiner the bishop was touched, who was a great man for keeping it. For in the ballad, Stephen Stockfish was bequeathed in this will to Stephen Gardiner. Of this he made a long complaint to the protector. But yet this neglect of Lent was not encouraged by the superiors; for it was kept at court, and preparations for the king's diet were made accordingly this Lent by the protector. The Protestants indeed were for keeping it, and an order was issued out for that purpose, though not upon a religious, but politic account. But the greater part of the ordinary people would not be brought to it by this distinction; so that the preachers were fain to be employed. Latimer preached, "That those that regarded not laws and statutes, were despisers of magistrates. There be laws made of diet," he said, "what meats we shall eat at all times. And this law is made in policy, as I suppose, for victual's sake, that fish might be uttered as well as other meat. Now as long as it goeth so politicly, we ought to keep it. Therefore all, except those that be dispensed withal, as sick, impotent persons, women with child, old folk, &c., ought to live in an ordinary obedience to those laws, and not to do against the same in any wise."[1]

Gardiner urged the great inconvenience these rhymes against Lent might occasion: "That they could serve for nothing but to learn the people to rail, and to make others forbear to make their usual provisions of fish against the ensuing year, fearing Lent to be sick, as the rhyme purported, and like to die."

---

[1] [See Parker Society's edition of Bishop Latimer's Works, vol. i. p. 372.]

About these times there arose much talk of the king's matching. The Protestants were much afraid of his marrying with some foreign princess abroad, that might turn his heart from religion. But the popishly affected did their endeavours to persuade him to please himself with some lady abroad, as best agreeable with politic ends, as the enlarging of his dominions, and the surety and defence of his countries. Some therefore put Latimer upon giving the king counsel in this matter from the pulpit. So he advised the king to choose him one that is of God, that is, which is of the household of faith; and such an one as the king can find in his heart to love, and lead his life in pure and chaste espousage with. "Let him choose a wife that fears God. Let him not choose a proud wanton, and one full only of rich treasures and worldly pomp."[1]

The sentiments of the Protestant foreigners concerning the present English state deserves a particular remark. They took such great joy and satisfaction in this good king, and his establishment of religion, that the heads of them, Bullinger, Calvin, and others, in a letter to him, offered to make him their defender, and to have bishops in their churches as there were in England, with the tender of their service to assist and unite together. This nettled the learned at the Council of Trent, who came to the knowledge of it by some of their private intelligencers; and they verily thought, that all the heretics, as they called them, would now unite among themselves, and become one body, receiving the same discipline exercised in England. Which if it should happen, and that they should have heretical bishops near them in those parts, they concluded that Rome and her clergy would utterly fall. Whereupon were sent two of their emissaries from Rotterdam into England, who were to pretend themselves Anabaptists, and preach against baptizing infants, and preach up rebaptizing, and a fifth monarchy upon earth. And besides this, one D. G., authorized by these learned men, despatched a letter written in May, 1549, from Delf in Holland, to two bishops, whereof Winchester was one, signifying the coming of these pretended Anabaptists, and that they should receive them, and cherish them, and take their parts, if they should chance to receive any checks; telling them, that it was left to them to assist in this cause, and to some others, whom they knew to be well affected to the mother-church. This letter is lately put in print.[1] Sir Henry Sidney first met with it in Queen Elizabeth's closet, among some papers of Queen Mary's. He transcribed it into a book of his, called "The Romish Policies." It came afterwards into the hands of Archbishop Usher; and was transcribed thence by Sir James Ware. Let it be remembered here, and noted, that about this time Winchester was appointed, with Ridley, bishop of Rochester, to examine certain Anabaptists in Kent.

---

[1] [Id. pp. 95, 97, 243.]

I find no bishops consecrated this year.

CHAPTER XVI.

Ridley made Bishop of London. The Communion Book reviewed.

Ridley, bishop of Rochester, was designed to succeed Bonner, lately deprived, in the bishopric of London; and, April 3, took his oath, an half-year being almost spent before he entered upon the care of that see, after Bonner's deprivation. At his entrance, he was exceeding wary not to do his predecessor the least injury in goods that belonged to him. He had not one pennyworth of his moveable goods; for if any were found and known to be his, he had license to convey them away; otherwise they were safely preserved for him. There was some quantity of lead lay in the house, which he used about it and the church; but Ridley paid for it, as Bonner's own officers knew. He continued Bonner's receiver, one Staunton, in his place. He paid fifty-three or fifty-five pounds for Bonner's own servants' common liveries and wages, which was Bonner's own debt remaining unpaid after his deposition. He frequently sent for old Mrs. Bonner, his predecessor's mother, calling her his mother, and caused her to sit in the uppermost seat at his own table,; as also for his sister, Mrs. Mongey. It was observed how Ridley welcomed the old gentlewoman, and made as much of her as though she had been his own mother: and though sometimes the lords of the council dined with him, he would not let her be displaced; but would say,—"By your lordships' favour, this place of right and custom is for my mother Bonner." But to see the base ingratitude of Bonner; when he was restored again in Queen Mary' reign, he used Ridley far otherwise than Ridley had used him; for he would not allow the leases which Ridley had made, which was in danger to redound to the utter ruin and decay of many poor men. He had a sister with three children, whom he married to one Shipside, a servant of his, and provided for them. This sister Bonner turned out of all, and endeavoured the destruction of Shipside, had not Bishop Heath delivered him. Ridley, in his offices, and in an iron chest in his bedchamber, had much plate, and considerable quantities of other goods; all which Bonner seized upon; insomuch that Ridley, but a little before his burning, wrote a supplicatory letter to the queen to take this into her consideration, "That the poor men might enjoy their leases, and years renewed, for that they were made without fraud or covin, either for their parts, or his; and the old rents always reserved to the see, without any kind of damage thereof: or at least, that they might be restored to their former leases and years, and might have rendered to them again such sums of money as they paid him and the chapter, as fines for their leases and years taken from them. Which fines he desired the queen would command might be made good out of the plate and other things he left in his house; half whereof would disburse those fines."[1] This did so much run in the good man's mind, that, at the time of his burning, he desired the Lord Williams, then present, to remember this his suit to the queen. Which he promised him he would do. But what effect it had, I cannot tell.

---

[1] Foxes and Firebrands, part ii. [p. 11. Strype was in error in attributing this book to Sir James Ware. See Eccl. History, Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 193].

In the vacancy of the church at Rochester, by the remove of Ridley, the archbishop committed the spiritualities to William Cook, LL.D., April 18.

---

[1] Ridley's letter, among the letters of the Martyrs; [for which see Parker Society's edition of Works, pp. 427—429, and Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vii. p. 545].

The nobility and gentry this year flying so much upon the spoil of the Church, Bucer, by the archbishop's instigation, as well as his own inclinations, wrote to the marquis of Dorset to forbear, dissuading him from spoiling the Church of her maintenance. In which letter he hath these expressions:—"Antiquum dictum est, neminem posse vere ditari furtis aut rapinis quibus invaduntur res alienæ; multo minus peculatu, quo defraudatur respublica. Quem igitur habeat sensum Dei, qui dubitet, minime omnium posse cujusquam opes augeri salutariter sacrilegiis, quibus acciduntur res ecclesiasticæ? Sunt nimium amplæ hæc opes, addictæ ecclesiis; et in luxum permulti eas diripiunt. Homines plane otiosi; nec ullam reipublicæ conferentes utilitatem. Submoveantur igitur hi fuci ab ecclesiæ alvearibus, nec depasci permittantur apum labores. Deinde procurentur, ut restitutis passim scholis nusquam desint ecclesiarum frugi ministri, &c."[1] That is, "It is an old saying, nobody can grow rich by the stealing and taking away of private people's possessions; much less by robbing of the public. What sense therefore hath he of God, that doubts not that his riches shall increase to good purpose that commits sacrilege, and robs the Church of what belongs to it? But it is objected, the Church hath too much, and many spend it in luxury; the churchmen are idle, and bring no profit to the commonwealth. Let these drones therefore be removed from the hives of the Church; but let not the pains of the bees be eaten up. And then having schools of good literature everywhere restored, let not the Church want sober ministers, &c."

A review was made of the Book of Common Prayer, about the latter end of the year, by Archbishop Cranmer and the bishops. Divers things that savoured too much of superstition, were endeavoured to be changed or amended; but there were amongst them some that made what opposition they could. The archbishop had now by Wilks, master of Christ's College, desired Bucer (that great divine, then at Cambridge), that he would take an impartial view of the whole book, having procured him a translation of it into Latin, done by Aless, the learned Scotch divine, for his understanding of it; and that he should judge, if he thought anything in the book might be more explained agreeable with God's word, and for better edification of faith. Bucer in answer sent the archbishop word, first, what his judgment was of the book, and then what course he intended to use in the examination of it, that he was now to make. He said that when he first came into England, and by the help of an interpreter took some knowledge of the rites and doctrines of this Church, that he might see whether he could join his ministry with it, he thanked God, "that had inclined the officers of the church to reform the ceremonies to that degree of purity; and that he found nothing in them that was not taken out of the word of God, or at least was not repugnant to it, being fitly taken.[1] For some few things there were," added he, "that, unless they were candidly interpreted, might seem not so sufficiently agreeable with the word of God." As for what he was now to do in order to the fulfilling what the archbishop required of him, he intended in short notes, at every chapter of the book, to observe what he thought to be according to God's word, and to be retained and vindicated; what to be taken away or mended, and what to be more plainly explained and allowed. After his perusal of the book, he gave this judgment in general: "That in the description of the communion and daily prayers, he saw nothing enjoined in the book but what was agreeable to the word of God, either in word, as the psalms and lessons; or in sense, as the collects. Also that the manner of their lessons and prayers, and the times of using them, were constituted very agreeable both with God's word, and the observation of the ancient churches; and therefore that that book ought to be retained and vindicated with the greatest strictness."[2] What particular animadversions the said learned man made upon the book, may be seen in his *Scripta Anglicana*, and in the bishop of Sarum's History, as he hath there abridged them.[1] And such a deference was given to his judgment, that most of the things that he excepted against were corrected accordingly. And, that the book might be the more exact, and perhaps be the more agreeable to the doctrine and practice of foreign churches, the archbishop recommended the diligent examination of it unto another great divine, Peter Martyr, who was now at Lambeth; the archbishop desiring him to note what he thought good concerning the book, and, because he knew not the language, the version of Sir John Cheke, who had also translated it into Latin, was given him. He was also requested to set down in writing what he thought deserved correction. And he accordingly made his annotations.

---

[1] MSS. C.C.C.C. Miscellan. A. [No. cxiii. p. 3. See Eccl. Hist. Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 199].

---

[1] "Nec enim quicquam in illis deprehendi quod non sit ex verbo Dei desumptum, aut saltem ei non adversetur, commode acceptum."—*Buceri Scripta Anglican.*

[2] "Modus quoque harum lectionum ac precum, et tempora, sunt admodum congruenter, et cum verbo Dei, et observatione priscarum ecclesiarum constituta. Religione igitur summa retinenda erit, et vindicanda hæc ceremonia."—*Censura, inter Scripta Anglicana,*" [pp. 456, 457].

Martyr agreed clearly in judgment with Bucer about the book, as he wrote to him in a letter sent him to Cambridge, extant among Archbishop Parker's manuscripts. On the back-side of which letter is written, by that archbishop's own hand, *Censura libri communium precum.*[2] In this letter Martyr told Bucer, that the same things that he disapproved of, the same likewise had he [Peter Martyr] done; and that afterward he drew them up into articles, and showed them to the archbishop of Canterbury. That to all that Bucer judged ought to be amended, he had subscribed; and that he thanked God, that had given occasion to admonish the bishops of these things. From this letter it appears that the archbishop had told Martyr, that, in the conference among the divines concerning the correction of these public prayers, it was concluded to make many alterations. But what those things were, as the archbishop told him not, so neither, as he wrote, did he dare to ask him. But what Cheke told him did not a little refresh him; viz. "That if they themselves would not change what ought to be changed, the king would do it of himself; and, when they came to a parliament, the king would interpose his majesty's own authority."

---

[1] [Vol. ii. p. 319, *et seq.*]

[2] MSS. C.C.C.C. vol. intit. Epist. Viror. Illustr. et German. [No. cxix. p. 39. See Eccl. Hist. Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 204].

CHAPTER XVII.

Hooper's Troubles.

In the month of July John Hooper, who had lived long abroad in Germany and in Switzerland, and conversed much with Bullinger and Gualter, the chief reformers there, but returned into England in King Edward's reign, and retained by the duke of Somerset, and a famous preacher in the city, was nominated by the king to the bishopric of Gloucester. But by reason of certain scruples of conscience he made to the wearing of the old pontifical habits, as the chimere and rochet, and suchlike, and disliking the oath customarily taken, he was not consecrated till eight months after, and endured not a little trouble in the mean season. Soon after his nomination he repaired to the archbishop, desiring him in these things to dispense with him; but the archbishop, for certain reasons, refused it. Then was the archbishop solicited by great men. The earl of Warwick, afterwards the great duke of Northumberland, wrote to him a letter, dated July 23, the bearer whereof was Hooper himself, that the rather, at his instance, he would not charge the bishop elect of Gloucester with an oath burdenous to his conscience. Which was, I suppose, the oath of canonical obedience.[1] And when Hooper had sued to the king, either to discharge him of the bishopric, or that he might be dispensed with in the ceremonies used in consecration (which he knew the archbishop could not do, no more than to dispense with the laws of the land, whereby he should run into a *præmunire*), the king wrote a letter to Cranmer, dated August 5, therein freeing him of all manner of dangers, penalties, and forfeitures that he might incur by omitting those rites; but yet (by anything that appears in the letter), without any urging or persuasion used to the archbishop to omit the said rites, leaving that to his own discretion. But the archbishop thought the king's bare letters were not sufficient to secure him against established laws.

---

[1] [Strype is here in error; the oath referred to was not that of "canonical obedience," but of "supremacy," which thus began;—"By God, by the Saints, and by the Holy Gospels." See Fox's Acts and Monuments, Appendix, vol. vi. p. 777.]

When this would not do, then endeavour was used to satisfy Hooper's conscience. And Ridley, bishop now of London, was thought, for his great learning, to be a fit person to confer with him. There were long arguings between them, and at last it came to some heats. And Hooper still remained resolved not to comply, holding it, if not unlawful, yet highly inexpedient, to use those very vestments that the papal bishops used. The council upon this sent for Hooper, and, because they would in no wise the stirring up of controversies between men of one profession, willed him to cease the occasion hereof. Hooper humbly besought them, that, for declaration of his doings, he might put in writing such arguments as moved him to be of the opinion he held, which was granted him. These arguments it seems were communicated to Ridley to answer.[1] And October the 6th, the council being then at Richmond, the archbishop present, they wrote to the bishop of London, commanding him to be at court on Sunday next, and to bring with him what he should for answer think convenient.

In the mean time, to bring the question to more evidence and satisfaction, the archbishop, according to his custom, to consult in religious matters with the learnedest men of other nations, wrote to Cambridge to Martin Bucer for his judgment; who, upon occasion of this controversy, wrote two epistles; one to Hooper, and another to the archbishop, both *de re vestiaria*. That to the latter was in answer to these two queries, which Cranmer had sent for his resolution about.

"I. Whether, without offending of God, the ministers of the Church of England may use those garments which are now used, and prescribed to be used by the magistrates?"

"II. Whether he that affirms it unlawful, or refuseth to use these garments, sinneth against God, because he saith that is unclean which God hath sanctified; and against the magistrate, who commandeth a political order?"

Bucer to both these questions gave his resolution in the affirmative, in his answer to the archbishop, dated December 8. But he thought, considering how the habits had been occasion to some of superstition, and to others of contention, that it were better, at some good opportunity, wholly to take them away.[1]

---

[1] MS. of the Council Book, [which is preserved amongst the Harl. MSS. in the British Museum, ccclii. 113].

Besides Bucer's letter to Hooper from Cambridge, mentioned before, Peter Martyr from Oxon wrote him a large letter, dated November 4; for both these good men were desirous that Hooper should have satisfaction, that so useful a man might come in place in the Church. To both these Hooper had wrote, and sent his arguments against the episcopal vestments, by a messenger despatched on purpose. Martyr[2] told him, "That he took much delight in that singular and ardent study that appeared in him, that Christian religion might again aspire to a chaste and pure simplicity. That for his part he could be very hardly brought off from that simple and pure way, which he knew they used a great while at Strasburg, where the difference of garments in holy things was taken away. And so he prayed God it might continue." Thus, he said, Hooper might see that, in the sum, they both agreed together; he wishing for that which Hooper endeavoured. That in rites, he was for coming as near as possible to the sacred Scripture, and for taking pattern by the better times of the Church; but yet that he could not be brought by his arguments to think that the use of garments was destructive, or in their own nature contrary, to the word of God; a matter which he thought to be altogether *ἀδιάφορον*. And that therefore indifferent things, as they were sometimes to be taken away, so might be used; and that if he had thought this were wicked, he would never have communicated with the Church of England. That there might be some great good follow from the use at present of the garments; namely, that if we suffered the Gospel to be first preached, and well rooted, men would afterwards better and more easily be persuaded to let go these outward customs. But now, when a change is brought in of the necessary heads of religion, and that with so great difficulty, if we should make those things that are indifferent to be impious, so we might alienate the minds of all; that they would not endure to hear solid doctrine, and receive the necessary ceremonies. That there was no doubt England owed much to him for his great pains in preaching and teaching; and, in return, he had gained much favour and authority in the realm, whereby he was in a capacity of doing much good to the glory of God. Only he bade Hooper take heed, that by unseasonable and too bitter sermons he became not an hindrance to himself. Besides, that by looking upon these indifferent things as sinful and destructive, we should condemn many Gospel churches, and too sharply tax very many, which anciently were esteemed most famous and celebrated.

---

[1] Script. Anglic. pp. 705 et 681.

[2] Inter P. Mart. Epist. [ad Calc. Locor. Comm. p. 1085, ed. Tig. 1587. The original text of this letter is given in the Eccl. Hist. Society's ed. vol. ii. Appendix, No. 46*, p. 616, *et seq.*]

And whereas there were two arguments that made Hooper ready to charge the use of these vestments to be not indifferent; he proceeded to consider them. One was this, "That this would be to call back again the priesthood of Aaron. The other, that they were inventions of Antichrist; and that we ought to be estranged, not only from the Pope, but from all his devices."

But as to the former he showed him, "That the Apostles, for peace'-sake, commanded the Gentiles to abstain from blood and fornication, which were Aaronical customs; and so are tithes for the maintenance of the clergy. Psalms and hymns can scarce be shown to be commanded in the New Testament to be sung in public assemblies, which are very manifest to be used in the Old. That there are not a few things that our church hath borrowed from the Mosaical decrees, and that even from the very first times. The festivals of the Resurrection, of the Nativity, of Pentecost, and of the death of Christ, are all footsteps of the old law; and are they to be therefore abolished? He wished with all his heart that the churches in Germany by this one loss might obtain their former liberty."

As to the second argument, "He could not see how it could be asserted upon good grounds, that nothing is to be used by us that is observed in the Popish religion. We must take heed that the Church of God be not pressed with too much servitude, that it may not have liberty to use anything that belonged to the Pope. Our ancestors took the idol temples, and used them for sacred houses to worship

Christ. And the revenues that were consecrated to the Gentile gods, and to the games of the theatre, and of the vestal virgins, were made use of for the maintenance of the ministers of the Church, when these before had served not only to Antichrist, but to the devil. Nor could he presently grant that these differences of garments had their original from the Pope; for we read in ecclesiastical history, that John at Ephesus wore a *petalum* [a mitre]. And Pontius Diaconus saith of Cyprian, that when he went to be executed he gave his *birrus*[1] to the executioner, his *dalmatica*[1] to the deacons, and stood in linen. And Chrysostom makes mention of the white garments of ministers. And the ancients witness, that when the Christians came to Christ, they changed their garments, and for a gown put on a cloak; for which when they were mocked by the heathens, Tertullian wrote a learned book, 'De Pallio.' And he knew Hooper was not ignorant, that to those that were initiated in baptism, was delivered a white garment. Therefore, before the tyranny of the Pope, there was a distinction of garments in the Church.

"Nor did he think, that in case it were granted that it was invented by the Pope, that the iniquity of popery was so great, that whatsoever it touched was so dyed and polluted thereby, that good and godly men might not use it to any holy purpose. Hooper himself granted, that every human invention was not therefore presently to be condemned. It was an human invention to communicate before dinner; it was an human invention, that the things sold in the primitive church were brought and laid at the Apostles' feet. That he was ready to confess with him that these garments were an human invention, and of themselves edified not; but it was thought by some conducive to be borne with for a time; for that it might be a cause of avoiding those contentions, whereby greater benefits might be in danger to be obstructed. But that if hence an occasion of erring might be given to the weak, they were to be admonished, that they should hold these things indifferent; and they were to be taught in sermons, that they should judge not God's worship to be placed in them."

Hooper had writ, that the eyes of the standers-by, by reason of these garments, would be turned away from thinking of serious things, and detained in gazing upon them. But this would not happen when the garments were simple and plain, without bravery, and such as hitherto were used in the service of God. But Martyr answered, "That use and custom would take away admiration, and perhaps, when the people were moved with admiration, they would the more attentively think of those things that are serious. For which end," he said, "the sacraments seemed to be invented, that from the sight and sense of them we might be carried to think of divine things."

---

[1] Episcopal garments.

Hooper urged moreover, "That 'whatsoever was not of faith, was sin.'" But said Martyr, "That we may enjoy a quiet conscience in our doings, that of the Apostle seems much to tend, and that 'to the clean all things are clean,' saith the same Apostle to Titus; and to Timothy, that 'every creature of God is good.'"

He urged also, "That we ought to have express Scripture for what we do in holy things." But Martyr was not of that mind; "but that that was enough in general, to know by faith that indifferent things cannot defile those, who act with a pure and sincere mind and conscience." And this was the substance of P. Martyr's judgment of these things, which might give much light to that reverend man in this controversy, though he was not yet convinced, nor could comply.

As Hooper all this while refused the habit, so we may conjecture, by a passage in the former letter, that he liberally declaimed against them in the London pulpits. For Martyr takes notice to him of his "unseasonable and too bitter sermons." Whether it were for this, or his incompliance, or both together, I know not; but at length he was by the privy-council[1] commanded to keep his house; unless it were to go to the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishops of Ely [Goodrich], London [Ridley], or Lincoln [Holbeach], for counsel and satisfaction of his conscience; and neither to preach nor read till he had further license from the council. But, notwithstanding this command, he kept not his house, and writ a book and printed it, intituled, "'A Confession of his Faith;" written in such a manner, that it gave more distaste, and wherein was contained matter he should not have written. He went about also complaining of the king's counsellors; as Martyr wrote in a private letter to Bucer.

---

[1] Council Book.

On January the 13th, the court then at Greenwich, he appeared there before the council, the archbishop being then present, touching the matter of not wearing the apparel, and for disobeying the council; who for this disobedience, and for that he continued in his former opinion of not wearing the apparel prescribed for bishops to wear, committed him to the archbishop of Canterbury's custody, either there to be reformed, or further punished, as the obstinacy of his cause required.

Being with the archbishop, he did his endeavour to satisfy him. But Hooper was as immoveable to whatsoever the said archbishop could propound and offer, as he was before with Ridley. So the archbishop signified to the council,[1] that he could bring him to no conformity, but that he declared himself for another way of ordination than was established. The effect of this was, that on January 27, upon this letter of the archbishop, "That Hooper could not be brought to any conformity; but rather, persevering in his obstinacy" (they are the words of the Council-book), "coveted to prescribe orders and necessary laws of his head; it was agreed that he should be committed to the Fleet." And a letter was drawn for the archbishop to send Mr. Hooper to the Fleet upon the occasion aforesaid; and another letter to the warden of the Fleet to receive him, and to keep him from the conference with any person, saving the ministers of that house.[2] This disobedience of Hooper to the council's orders will make the severity of the council less liable to censure. Neither was Cranmer any other ways instrumental to Hooper's imprisonment, than by doing that which was expected from him, viz. giving a true account of his unsuccessful dealing with him. But at last he complied, and received consecration after the usual form; and the Church enjoyed a most excellent instrument in him at this time for his learning, zeal, courage, and activity.

This news Peter Martyr signified in a letter to Gualter; for he and Bullinger, and the rest of his friends at Zurich, had heard of this contention, and were much concerned for this their acquaintance. But as he was consecrated in March, so in April following Martyr wrote to the said Gualter, "That he had never been wanting to Hooper [whether in his counsel for satisfying his conscience, or in respect of his interest with the archbishop, or other chief men], and that he always hoped well of his cause. That he now was freed of all his troubles, and that he was actually in his bishopric, and did discharge his office piously and strenuously." This was the more acceptable news to the foreigners, because some of the bishops took occasion, upon this disobedience of Hooper, liberally to blame the churches abroad, among which Hooper had been, as though they had infused these principles into him; and then fell foul upon Bucer and Martyr, that were set, the one professor in Cambridge, and the other in Oxon; as though they would corrupt all the youth in both universities, who would suck in from them such principles as Hooper had done. This Bucer heard of, and writ it with a concern to Martyr. Who writ again, how amazed and almost stupified he was to hear this; but that it was well that the bishops saw his letter to Hooper, which would vindicate him from such imputations. And indeed both his and Bucer's letter, concerning this point, did or might seasonably stop this clamour.

---

[1] Council Book [Harl. MSS. ccclii. 128].

[2] [Id. 131.]

CHAPTER XVIII.

Bishop Hooper visits his Diocese.

The summer next after his consecration he went down and made a strict visitation of his diocese, fortified with letters from the privy-council; that so his authority might be the greater, and do the more good among an ignorant, superstitious, stubborn clergy and laity. I have seen a manuscript in folio, giving an account of the whole visitation, of the method thereof, and of the condition he found the clergy of the diocese in, as to their learning and abilities.

First, he sent a general monitory letter to his clergy, signifying his intention of coming among them; gravely advising them of their office, and what was required of them who were entered into this holy vocation. This letter may be found in the Appendix.[1] When he visited them, he gave them articles concerning Christian religion, to the number of fifty; which bore this title: "Articles concerning Christen Religion, given by the Reverend Father in Christ John Hoper, Bishop of Gloucester, unto all and singular Deans, Parsons, Prebendaries, Vicars, Curates, and other ecclesiastical ministers within the diocese of Gloucester, to be had and retained of them for the unity and agreement, as well as the doctrine of God's word, as also for the confirmation of the ceremonies agreeing with God's word." Let me give the reader but a taste of them.

"I. That none do teach any manner of thing to be necessary for the salvation of man, other than what is contained in the books of God's holy word.

"II. That they faithfully teach and instruct the people committed unto their charge, that there is but one God, everlasting, incorporate, almighty, wise, and good, the maker of heaven and earth, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also He will be called upon by us. And though one God in essence and unity in the Godhead, yet in the same unity three distinct persons.

"III. That they teach all the doctrines contained in the three creeds.

"IV. That they teach that the Church of God is the congregation of the faithful, wherein the word of God is truly preached, and the sacraments justly ministered, according to the institution of Christ; and that the Church of God is not by God's word taken for the multitude or company of men, as of bishops, priests, and such other; but that it is the company of all men hearing God's word, and obeying to the same; lest that any man should be seduced, believing himself to be bound unto an ordinary succession of bishops and priests, but only unto the word of God, and the right use of his sacraments.

"V. That though the true church cannot err from the faith; yet nevertheless, forasmuch as no man is free from sin and lies, there is, nor can be any church known, be it never so perfect or holy, but it may err." These are the five first.

---

[1] No. XLVII.

Then he gave them injunctions to the number of one and thirty; seven and twenty interrogatories and demands of the people and parishioners, and of their conversation, to be required and known by the parsons, vicars, and curates. Sixty-one interrogatories and examinations of the ministers, and of their conversation, to be required and known by the parishioners. There were also articles, whereupon all ministers were examined, concerning the Ten Commandments, the Articles of faith, and the petitions of the Lord's Prayer; viz. to each minister were these questions put:—

1. Concerning the Commandments,
   1. How many Commandments.
   2. Where they are written.
   3. Whether they can recite them by heart.
2. Concerning the Christian Faith,
   1. What are the articles of the Christian faith.
   2. Whether they can recite them by heart.
   3. That they corroborate them by authority of Scripture.
3. Concerning the Lord's Prayer.
   1. Whether they can say the petitions by heart.
   2. How they know it to be the Lord's Prayer.
   3. Where it is written.

Which demands, how easy soever they were, many curates and priests—such was the ignorance of those days—could say but little to. Some could say the Pater Noster in Latin, but not in English. Few could say the Ten Commandments. Few could prove the Articles of faith by Scripture; that was out of their way.

The memory of such as have been greatly useful in the church or state ought religiously to be preserved. Of this number was this bishop, who, as he was naturally an active man, put forth all his strength and vigour of body and mind to set forward a good reformation in religion, and afterwards as courageously shed his blood for it.

Therefore I cannot part with this good prelate till I have gathered up and reposited here some further memorials of him. The diocese of Worcester becoming void by the deprivation of Heath in October, 1551, and requiring an industrious man to be set over that see, it was given to Hooper to hold *in commendam.* In the year 1552, in July, he visited that diocese, which he found much out of order. But before he had finished, he was fain to go back to Gloucester, hearing of the ungodly behaviour of the ministers there. He left them the last year seemingly very compliant to be reformed, and took their subscription to his articles of religion. But in his absence, when his back was turned, they became as bad altogether as they were before. Yet he conceived good hopes of the lay-people, if they had but good justices and faithful ministers placed among them, as he wrote to Secretary Cecil, to whom he signified his desire that the articles of religion, which the king had mentioned to him when last at London, were set forth. Them he intended to make the clergy not only subscribe (which, being privately done, he saw they regarded not), but to read and confess them openly before their parishioners. At his visitation he constituted certain of his clergy superintendents, who in his absence were to have a constant eye over the inferior clergy.

After this visit to Gloucester, he returned back again to Worcester in October, and then proceeded in his visitation there. Here Johnson and Jolliffe, two canons of this church, disallowing some doctrines recommended to them by the bishop, in his articles abovesaid, held a dispute thereupon with him and Mr. Harley, who was afterward bishop of Hereford. And one of these behaved himself most insolently and disrespectfully to both. The bishop sent up by Harley a large relation of his visitation in writing, and the matter these canons misliked, and recommended Harley to the secretary to give account of the disputation. This caused him to break out into a complaint for want of good men in the cathedrals: "Ah! Mr. Secretary, that there were good men in the cathedral churches! God then should have much more honour than He hath, the king's majesty more obedience, and the poor people better knowledge; but the realm wanteth light in such churches, whereas of right it ought most to be." In Worcester church he now put in execution the king's injunctions for the removal of superstition; for which there arose a great clamour against him, as though he had spoiled the church; and yet he did no more than the express words of the injunctions commanded to be done.

After his visitation was over, he accounted not his work done; but soon went over both his dioceses again, to take account of his clergy, how they profited since his last examining them; and to oversee even his superintendents themselves, to commend their well-doings, and to see what was ill done. So great was his pains and zeal, which made him most truly and experimentally write as he did to the secretary—"There is none that eat their bread in the sweat of their face, but such as serve in public vocation. Yours is wonderful, but mine passeth. Now I perceive that private labours be but plays, nor private troubles but ease and quietness." These matters I extract from two original letters of this bishop to Secretary Cecil, which I have thought well worthy of preserving in the Appendix;[1] and there they may be met with.

Whereas it was mentioned before, how the bishop had sent up a writing of the matters in controversy between the two canons and himself, we may see what care the council[2] took hereof, and what countenance they gave the bishop, by an order they made November 6, 1552. Which was, "that a letter should be wrote to Mr. Cheke and Mr. Harley, to consider certain books sent unto them touching matters of religion in controversy between the bishop of Worcester and two of the canons of Worcester, and to certify their opinion hither, that further order may be therein taken.

"January 29, 1551. Upon suit made by the duchess of Somerset to Sir Philip Hobby, and Mr. Darcy, Lieutenant of the Tower, to be a mean unto the king's majesty, and my lords, that the bishop of Gloucester (who had been chaplain unto the duke), might be suffered to have access unto her for the settling of her conscience; order was by their lordships taken for the same, and a letter written to the lieutenant of the Tower in that behalf, as followeth:—'To the lieutenant of the Tower, to permit the bishop of Gloucester, from time to time, to speak with the duchess of Somerset, in the presence of Sir Philip Hobby, and of the said lieutenant; and in case the said lady of Somerset desire to speak with the said bishop apart, that in that case they license her so to do.'

---

[1] No. XLVIII.

[2] MSS. Council Book, [Privy Council office, 636, which was collated for the Eccl. History, Society's edition, and is herein followed].

"May 29, 1552. A warrant to make a book to the elect bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, of discharge of the first-fruits and tenths to be paid for the same, in consideration that he hath departed with certain lands to the king's majesty; which probably he seeing would, whether he would or no, be pulled away from him, to be conferred upon some of the mighty of the court, made the best of a bad market, and got himself freed from that charge, payable to the king.

"April 12, 1553. A letter was wrote to the chancellor of the augmentations, to cause a book to be made from the bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, of a surrender to the king's majesty of his jurisdiction in the forest of Dean, with a certain deanery, which of right belongeth to the bishopric of Hereford; and thereupon to make another book of the grant thereof from his highness to Mr. Harley, elect bishop of Hereford.

"April 16, 1553. A letter to the chancellor of the augmentations, to cause a book to be devised in form of law, licensing the bishop of Worcester and Gloucester to give to three poor vicarages in his diocese, the parsonages whereof are impropriated to his bishopric, such augmentation of living towards their better maintenance, as he shall think convenient, out of the lands of the said see.

"April 25, 1553. A warrant to the receiver of the wards, to deliver to the bishop of Worcester, by way of reward, twenty pounds for his attendance here ever since the Parliament by his majesty's commandment." These are transcriptions out of a council-book.

CHAPTER XIX.

Troubles of Bishop Gardiner.

In this year 1550, the council and our archbishop had much trouble with some other bishops also, of a quite different judgment from the above spoken of; I mean Gardiner, bishop of Winchester; Nicolas [Heath], bishop of Worcester; and Day, bishop of Chichester; of whom what I shall here briefly set down are for the most part extractions out of an old council-book, and King Edward's Journal.

At Greenwich, June 8, was this order of council concerning Bishop Gardiner: "Considering the long imprisonment that the bishop of Winchester hath sustained, it was now thought time he should be spoken withal; and agreed, that if he repented his former obstinacy, and would henceforth apply himself to advance the king's majesty's proceedings, his highness in this case would be his good lord, and remit all his errors past; otherwise his majesty was resolved to proceed against him as his obstinacy and contempt required. For the declaration whereof, the duke of Somerset, the lord treasurer, the lord privy seal, the lord great chamberlain, and Mr. Secretary Petre, were appointed the next day [*i.e.* June 9] to repair unto him. Signed by E. Somerset, T. Cant, W. Wilts, J. Bedford, E. Clynton, T. Ely, A. Wingfeld, W. Herbert, W. Petre, Edw. North."[1] Accordingly, June 9, the duke of Somerset, the marquis of Northampton, the lord treasurer, the earl of Bedford, and Secretary Petre, went to the bishop of Winchester, to know what he would stick to; whether to conform to and promote the king's laws, or no? He answered, "That he would obey and set forth all things set forth by the king and Parliament; and if he were troubled in conscience, he would reveal it to the council, and not reason openly against it." And then he desired to see the king's book of proceedings. At Greenwich, June 10, report was made by the duke of Somerset and the rest, sent to the bishop of Winchester, that he desired to see the said book. The next day were the books sent to him, and delivered to him by the lieutenant of the Tower, as the council appointed, to see if he would set his hand to them, and promise to set them forth to the people. At Greenwich, June 13, the lieutenant of the Tower declared unto the council, that the bishop, having perused the books of the proceedings, said unto him, he could make no direct answer, unless he were at liberty, and so being, he would say his conscience. On the 14th day the duke of Somerset, and five more of the council, again repaired to the bishop, to whom he made this answer: "I have deliberately seen the book of Common Prayer. Although I would not have made it so myself, yet I find such things in it as satisfy my conscience; and therefore I will both execute it myself, and also see others my parishioners to do it." And this the counsellors testified under their hands as his saying.

---

[1] [Strype extracted all the above and the following details of the proceedings against Gardiner from the MSS. Council Book in the Harl. MSS. See also Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 79, *et seq.*]

July the 9th, there were certain articles drawn up, signed by king and council, for the bishop to subscribe, which contained the confession of his fault, the supremacy of the king and his successors, the establishing of holy-days, or dispensing with them to be in the king, the service-book to be godly and Christian, the acknowledgment of the king to be supreme head, and to submit to him and his laws under age, the abolishing the six articles, and the king's power of correcting and reforming the Church. These articles, together with a letter from the king, the earl of Warwick, lord great master, the Lord St. John, lord treasurer, Sir William Herbert, master of the horse, and Secretary Petre, carried to the bishop, requiring him to sign them. Which he did, only making exception to the first.

July 10, the said lords made report unto the council, that they had delivered the king's letter unto the bishop, together with the articles. Unto all which articles he subscribed thus with his own hand: "Stev. Winton," saving the first; against which he wrote in the margin these words: "I cannot in my conscience confess the preface, knowing myself to be of that sort I am indeed, and ever have been." To which articles, thus subscribed by the bishop, these of the council wrote their names; E. Somers, W. Wilts, J. Warwick, J. Bedford, W. Northampton, E. Clynton, G. Cobham, William Paget, W. Herbert, W. Petre, Edw. North.

July 11, at Westminster, this was brought to the council, and his boggling in this manner at the confession displeased the king, that being the principal point. But to the intent he should have no just cause to say he was not mercifully handled, it was agreed that Sir William Herbert and the secretary should go the next day to him to tell him that the king marvelled he refused to put his hand to the confession; and that if the words thereof seemed too sore, then to refer it to himself in what sort, and with what words he should devise to submit himself; that, upon the acknowledgment of his fault, the king might extend his mercy towards him, as was determined.

July 13, Sir William Herbert and the secretary reported, that the bishop stood precisely in his own justification. He said, "That he could not subscribe to the confession, because he was innocent; and also because the confession was but the preface to the articles." Upon this it was agreed by the council, that a new book of articles, and a new submission, should be devised for the bishop to subscribe. And [Ridley] the bishop of London, Secretary Petre, Mr. Cecil, and Goodrich, a common lawyer, were commanded to make these articles according to law. And then, for the more authentic proceeding with the bishop, the two former persons were again to resort to him with the new draught, and to take with them a divine, which was the bishop of London, and a lawyer, which was Goodrich. These articles were twenty-two in number, and to this tenor, "That King Henry VIII. had justly suppressed monasteries. That persons may marry, who are not prohibited to contract matrimony by the Levitical law, without the bishop of Rome's dispensation. That vowing or going pilgrimages were justly abolished; the counterfeiting St. Nicholas, St. Clement, &c. was mere mockery. That it is convenient that the Scriptures should be in English. That the late king, and the present, did upon just ground take into their hands chantries, which were for maintenance of private masses. That private masses were justly taken away by the statutes of the realm; and the communion placed instead thereof, is very godly. That it is convenient that the sacrament should be received in both kinds. That the mass, where the priest doth only receive, and others look on, is but the invention of man. That it was upon good and godly consideration ordered in the book, that the sacrament should not be lifted up, and showed to the people to be adored. That it is politicly and godly done, that images in churches, and mass-books, were enacted to be abolished. That bishops, priests, and deacons, have no commandment in the law of God to vow chastity, or abstain from marriage. And that all canons and constitutions, which do prohibit marriage to the clergy, be justly taken away by Parliament. That the Homilies, and the forms set forth of making archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, are godly and wholesome, and ought to be received. That the orders of subdeacon, benet, and colet, &c., be not necessary, and justly left out in the book of Orders. That the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines necessary to salvation. That upon good and godly consideration it was enjoined that Erasmus' Paraphrases should be set up in churches. And that it was the king's pleasure that the bishop should affirm these articles by subscription of his hand, and declare himself willing to publish and preach the same." These articles were brought to the bishop by the master of the horse and Secretary Petre, with the bishop of London and Goodrich. To whom the bishop answered, "That he would not consent to the article of submission; praying to be brought to his trial, and desired nothing but justice. And for the rest of the articles, when he was at liberty, then it should appear what he would do in them, it not being reasonable he should subscribe them in prison."

This being reported to the council, July 15, it was agreed that he should be sent for before the whole council, and examined, whether he would stand at this point? which if he did, then to denounce the sequestration of his benefice for three months, with intimation, if he reformed not in that space, to deprive him. This order was signed by Somerset, Wilts, Bedford, Clynton, Paget, Wyngfield, Herbert.

July 19, the bishop of Winton was brought before the council, and there the articles before mentioned were read unto him distinctly. Whereunto he refused either to subscribe or consent; answering in these words, "That in all things his majesty would command him, he was willing and most ready to obey; but forasmuch as there were divers things required of him, which his conscience would not bear, therefore he prayed them to have him excused." And thereupon Secretary Petre, by the council's order, proceeded to read the sequestration. Thus fairly and calmly was this bishop dealt with by the king and his council, from June 8 to July 19. And notwithstanding this sentence, the council favourably ordered, that the bishop's house and servants should be maintained in their present state until the expiration of the three months; and that the matter in the mean time should be kept secret.

The three months expired October 19; but with such clemency was he used that it was November 23 before his business was renewed. And then, considering the time of his intimation was long since expired, it was agreed,[1] that the bishop of Ely, Mr. Secretary Petre, Dr. May, and Dr. Glynne, all learned in the civil law, should substantially confer upon the matter; and upon Tuesday next, the 26th day of this present, to certify unto the council what was to be done duly by order of the law in this case. And now the archbishop of Canterbury began to be concerned in this troublesome business. A commission, dated December 12, was issued out from the king to the said archbishop, and to the bishops of London, Ely, Lincoln, to Sir William Petre, Sir James Hales, and some other lawyers, to call the said bishop of Winchester before them, and, continuing in his contempt, to proceed to deprive him.

December 14, the lieutenant of the Tower was ordered to bring the bishop on Monday next to Lambeth, before my lord of Canterbury, and other commissioners, upon his cause; and likewise upon their appointment to bring him thither from day to day, at times by them prefixed.

December 15 was the day of Winchester's first appearance. The business done this session was the opening and reading the commission; and, after that, divers articles against the bishop, who then made a speech; wherein, first, he protested against these his judges, and excepted against their commission; and required this his protestation to be entered into the acts of the court. Then desiring a copy of the commission, it was granted him, together with that of the articles too, to make his answers to. Next, the archbishop gave him his oath to make true answer, which he took still with his protestation. Then the bishop desiring counsel, the archbishop and the rest not only granted his request, but allowed him whomsoever he should name; which was the next day allowed also by an order of council. Certain honourable persons were deposed and sworn for witnesses, as Sir Anthony Wingfield, comptroller of the household; Sir William Cecil, secretary; Sir Ralph Sadler; Sir Edward North; Dr. Cox, almoner; and others. The bishop also protested against them, and the swearing of them. At this first sessions he had also said, in the hearing of a great multitude present, concerning the duke of Somerset and some other privy counsellors, sent to him in the Tower, "that they had made an end with him before for all the matters for which he was committed; insomuch that he verily thought he should never have heard any more of it."

---

[1] Council Book, [167].

This coming soon to the ears of these nobles, highly offended them, as reporting falsely of them. So that, to justify themselves in as public a manner, the next sessions they sent their letter, dated December 17, signed by the duke of Somerset, the earls of Wiltshire and Bedford, and Sir Edward North; wherein they denied any such matter, saying, "that the bishop defended his cause with untruths, and that, upon their fidelities and honours, his tale was false and untrue; for that their coming to him in the Tower was to do their endeavour to reclaim him. And they prayed the commissioners, that, for their vindication, they would cause this their letter to be publicly read." Which was accordingly done; though the bishop, thinking how this would reflect upon him under his former protestation, laboured hard that he might first be heard, and that he had something to propose why it should not be read. Which, notwithstanding, they would not grant.[1]

January 19. The council sitting at Greenwich, the bishop's servants came and desired that certain of them might be sworn upon certain articles for witness on his behalf. And if they might not be sworn, that upon their honours, as they would answer before God, they would witness truly according to their conscience, and as effectually as if they were sworn upon a book.[2] And they were allowed.

The bishop, to make his cause the more plausible, as though he were the public defender of the Roman Catholic Church in England at this time, laboured to make it believed, that he fell into all this trouble for the defence of the real presence in the sacrament, and for maintaining the

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. pp. 97, 98.]

[2] [Id. ibid. pp. 121, 122.]

Catholic doctrine in a sermon before the king;[1] and that he made his book to vindicate himself therein. And therefore, in one of his appearances before the commissioners, openly in the court delivered them his book against Archbishop Cranmer, printed in France; and, to make it suit the better, he had altered some lines in the beginning of his book, so as to make it to relate to his present case. But in truth Gardiner had wrote and finished his book before. This Cranmer unveiled in his answer to this book of Gardiner's, saying there, " that he made his book before he was called before the commissioners, as he could prove by a book under his own handwriting; and that he was called before the commissioners by his own suit and procurement, and as it were enforcing the matter. But indeed the true cause was, that he was called to justice for his manifest contempt and continual disobedience from time to time, or rather rebellion against the king's majesty; and was deprived of his state for the same."[2]

In short, after a great deal of pains and patience, the bishop was by the archbishop and the rest of the commissioners deprived, after no less than two-and-twenty sessions, held at divers places, that is, from the 15th of December to the 14th of February; though Stow falsely nameth but seven.[3] The bishop, when he saw the sentence definitive ready to be pronounced, made an appeal from them to the king; for his doing which he produced these reasons. For that these his pretended judges were not indifferent, but prejudiced against him. That my lord of Canterbury had caused him to be sent to prison, whereas the archbishop was only present at the council when he was by them ordered to the Tower; and so had Hales, Goodrich, and Gosnold counselled to send him thither. Also, that the archbishop, and [Ridley and Holbeach,] the bishops of London and Lincoln, did contrary to the laws ecclesiastical, and taught and set forth manifest condemned errors against the presence in the sacrament. And because the bishop, as well in his writings as otherwise, did set forth the Catholic faith of the very presence of Christ's body and blood; therefore they showed themselves unduly affected towards him. That Sir William Petre decreed the fruits of his bishopric to be sequestered *de facto, sed non de jure*, and now was judge in his own cause. But notwithstanding this appeal, the archbishop with the rest of the commissioners pronounced him deprived, and his bishopric void. After this was done, the bishop appealed again to the king, instantly, more instantly, most instantly, from their sentence as injust, and of no effect in law; and asked of them letters dimissory to be granted to him, and a copy of the judgment. But the judges declared they would first know the pleasure of the king and his council therein. And so this last session brake up.[1]

---

[1] [This Sermon was preached on St. Peter's day, June 29, 1548, and is given by Fox, vol. vi. p. 87.]

[2] Page 2. [See Parker Society's edition of Abp. Cranmer's Works, vol. i. p. 10.]

[3] [Stow's Annals, p. 605.]

The day after, being the 15th of February, the council sitting at Westminster, upon debating the bishop of Winton's case: "Forasmuch as it appeared he had at all times, before the judges of his cause, used himself unreverently to the king's majesty, and [very] slanderfully towards his council; and especially yesterday, being the day of his judgment given against him, he called his judges heretics and sacramentaries, they being there the king's commissioners, and of his highness' council; it was therefore concluded by the whole board, that he should be removed from the lodging he hath now in the Tower to a meaner lodging, and none to wait upon him but one, by the lieutenant's appointment, in such sort as by the resort of any man to him, he have not the means to send out to any man, or to hear from any man. And likewise that his books and papers be taken from him, and seen; and that from henceforth he have neither pen, ink, nor paper to write his determinable purposes, but be sequestered from all conferences, and from all means that may serve him to practise any way."[2]

March 8, at Westminster. This day, by the king's majesty's own appointment, Dr. Poinet, bishop of Rochester, was chosen bishop of Winchester. And the archbishop of Canterbury had given him 266*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* (*i. e.* 400 marks) for his pains and charges about the bishop of Winchester. And thus I have, from very authentic authority, gathered together these memorials of this turbulent haughty man; who was now so seasonably laid aside in this king's reign, till we hear of him loudly in the next; when he sufficiently wreaked his revenge against our good archbishop and the true religion.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 261.]

[2] Council Book [Harl. MSS. ccclii. 136].

CHAPTER XX.

Bishop Heath and Bishop Day, their Deprivations.

WHILE the aforesaid bishop lay under sequestration in the Tower, two other bishops, that were wayward to the king's proceedings in the reformation of the Church (viz. of Worcester and Chichester), came under the hands of the privy council, resolving to make them comply, or deprive them; that others, more willing and better affected to reformation, might succeed and do service in the Church, and that the archbishop might go forward with less stop and impediment in the good work he had dedicated himself unto. Both of them were of the archbishop's raising, and seemed very compliant with the archbishop during King Henry's reign. But now both hung off from him, seeming much offended with him for his relinquishing the doctrine of the corporeal presence, and for writing a book against it; whereof they made mention, with dislike, in their depositions in the bishop of Winchester's trial before the commissioners.[1]

In the last year, the year 1549, twelve learned divines, bishops and others, were appointed by the council to prepare a new book for the ordination of ministers, purged of the superstitions of the old ordinal. Heath, bishop of Worcester, was nominated for one of these; but he, not liking the thing, would not agree to what the others did, nor subscribe the book when made. For which, in March, he was committed to the Fleet; where he lay under easy confinement all the next year,—the year 1550; during which time I find him once produced as a witness on Bishop Gardiner's behalf.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. pp. 126, 240.]

But in the year 1551, the court being at Chelsea, and the council sitting September 22, by virtue of the king's express commandment, Nicolas, bishop of Worcester, was sent for, and came before the lords and others; to whom was repeated the cause of his imprisonment to be, for that he refused to subscribe the book devised for the form of making archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, being authorized by Parliament.[1] At the time of which refusal, being not only gently and reasonably required to subscribe it, but also being manifestly taught by divers other learned men, that all things contained in the book were good and true, and that the book was expedient and allowable, the said bishop declared himself to be a very obstinate man. And for this his doing, it was now showed unto him, that he deserved longer imprisonment. Nevertheless the king's majesty's clemency was such, that now if he had, or would reconcile himself to obey his majesty in this former commandment, he should recover the king's majesty's favour. For which cause it was told him, that he was then presently sent for, and willed now to subscribe the same. Whereunto he answered, "That he took the cause of his imprisonment to be as was alleged, and that also he was very gently used, rather like a son than a subject. Nevertheless," he said, "he remained still in the same mind, not willing to subscribe it, although he would not disobey it." And although he was reasoned withal by every of the said council in disproving his manner of answer, that he would not subscribe it, being everything in the said book, true and good; and being devised by eleven other learned men, to which he was joined as the twelfth, and received of all the whole estate of the realm; agreeing also that he would obey it, not subscribe it, which contained a contradiction in reason; yet he still, as a man not removable from his own conceit, refused to subscribe it. Whereupon, to prove all manner of ways for the winning of him to his duty, he was offered to have conference with learned men, and to have time to consider the matter better. Whereunto he said, "That he could not have better conference than he had heretofore; and well might he have time, but of other mind he thought never to be; adding, that there were many other things whereunto he would never consent, if he were demanded, as to take down the altars and set up tables." And in this sort, seeing him obstinately settled in mind not to be conformable, he was in the king's majesty's name expressly commanded and charged to subscribe the same book before Thursday next following, being the 24th hereof, upon pain of deprivation of his bishopric, to all and singular effects, which might follow thereof. And hearing the commandment, he resolutely answered, "He could not find in his conscience to do it, and should be well content to abide such end, either by deprivation or otherwise, as pleased the king's majesty." And so, as a man incorrigible, he was returned to the Fleet. This order was subscribed by these of the privy council: W. Wilts, J. Warwick, W. Herbert, W. Cecil, Jo. Mason.

---

[1] Council Book.

That which gave the council the first occasion against Day, bishop of Chichester, was, partly his refusal of complying with the order of changing the altars in his diocese into tables;[1] and partly going down into his diocese, and there preaching against it, and other matters of that nature then in agitation, to the raising of dangerous tumults and discontents among the people. This came to the council's ears; and, October 7, this year, Dr. Cox, the king's almoner, was ordered to repair into Sussex to appease the people by his good doctrine, which were now troubled through the seditious preaching of the bishop of Chichester and others.

November 8, the said bishop appeared before the council to answer such things as should be objected against him for preaching. And because he denied the words of his accusation, therefore he was commanded within two days to bring in writing what he preached.

November 30. This day the duke of Somerset declared to the council, that the bishop of Chichester came within two days past, and showed to him, that he received letters from the king's majesty, signed with his majesty's hand, and subscribed with the hands of divers lords of the council. The tenor of which letter here ensueth : "Right reverend Father in God, &c." [It is the same letter as is printed in Fox's Acts,[1] about pulling down altars.] According to this letter, the said bishop said he could not conform his conscience to do that he was by the said letter commanded ; and therefore prayed the said duke he might be excused. Whereunto the said duke, for answer, used divers reasons moving the said bishop to do his duty, and in such things to make no conscience, where no need is. Nevertheless the said bishop would not be removed from his former opinion. Therefore the said duke said, he would make report to the rest of the council. And so in the end he prayed the lords of the council this day, that the bishop might be sent for, and show his mind touching this case. Which was agreed, and commandment given for the bishop to be at the council the next day.

---

[1] Council Book.

December 1, the bishop came before the council ; and being asked what he said to the letters sent to him from the king's majesty, he answered, "That he could not conform his conscience to take down the altars in the churches, and in lieu of them to set up tables, as the letter appointed ; for that he seemed for his opinion to have the Scripture, and consent of the doctors and fathers of the Church ; and contrariwise did not perceive any strength in the six reasons, which were set forth by [Ridley] the bishop of London, to persuade the taking down altars and erection of tables." And then, being demanded what Scripture he had, he alleged a saying in Esay ;[2] which place, being considered by the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of London, and other lords of the council, was found of no purpose to maintain his opinion.

And thereupon, by the said archbishop and [Goodrich,] bishop of Ely, divers good reasons were given to prove that it was convenient to take down the altars, as things abused ; and in lieu of them to set up tables, as things most meet for the supper of the Lord, and most agreeable to the first constitution. And besides that, his other reasons were then fully answered.

Wherefore the council commanded him expressly, in the king's [majesty's] name, to proceed to the execution of his majesty's commandment in the said letter expressed. Whereunto he made request, "that he might not be commanded to offend his conscience; saying, if his conscience might be instructed to the contrary, he would not thus molest the council with his refusal." Which his saying, considered by the council, moved them to show thus much favour unto him; that they willed him to resort unto the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Ely or London, and confer with them in the matter, so as he might be instructed by them to accept the just command of the king's majesty with a safe conscience. And for his second answer, day was given him until the 4th of this month, at which day he was commanded to return again.

---

[1] [Vol. vi. p. 5.]

[2] Es. xix. 19.

December 4. This day the bishop of Chichester came before the council; and was demanded, Whether he had been with the archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops, according to the former order given him; who answered, "That he was one afternoon at Lambeth, to have waited on the archbishop; but he was answered, that he was at the court, and upon a demand what time his grace would come home, one of the chamberlains," as he saith, "answered, That he doubted it would be late ere his grace come home, because he so used; and therefore he tarried not. And to any other bishops he made no repair:" saying further, "he had not been well in health; for the which cause he took some physic yesterday." The archbishop thereunto said, that the same afternoon that the bishop of Chichester had been there, he came home very early on purpose to have conferred with the said bishop; for the which cause he had leave of the king's majesty the same day to depart home sooner than for other business he might conveniently. To the matter he was asked, What mind he was of touching the execution of the king's command; and what he could say why the same should not be obeyed? who answered as before, "That his conscience would not permit him to do the same; for that the same was against the Scripture and the doctors." And being asked of the first, he alleged a place in the last of Paul to the Hebrews, mentioning the word ALTAR;[1] which place, being considered, was manifestly by the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Ely declared to be meant of Christ; as the very context of the same most manifestly appeared to every reader. Next to this he alleged the former place of Esay, which also was most evident to be meant otherwise than he alleged, and so proved. And as to the use of the primitive church, besides the texts of the New Testament, it was most clearly by Origen contra Celsum proved, that in his time Christian men had no altars, by direct negative propositions. Besides this, the abuse of the altars was showed unto him, and reasons declared how necessary it was to reform the same. And touching the naming of the table an altar, it was left indifferent to him [so to name it,] because ancient writers sometimes call the table an altar. But yet, notwithstanding that his own reasons were fully solved, and divers good and weighty reasons made, he persevered in the pertinacy of his own singular opinion. Whereupon the council, rehearsing to him the evil that should come of this his disobedience if it should be suffered, commanded him, in the king's majesty's name, upon his allegiance expressly to become an obedient subject, and so to execute the king's majesty's commandment. And for that it should appear to him that there was as much favour meant as might be, not offending the king's majesty, in his majesty's behalf they would be so bold as to appoint him Sunday next to make his final answer; and in the mean time he might advise himself, and weigh the cause as it ought to be. And so the day was given him [for appearance].

---

[1] Heb. xiii. 10.

December 7, the bishop of Chichester again appeared before the council; and being asked touching the execution of his majesty's commandment in the letter, he answered plainly, "He could not do it, saving his conscience; for the altars seemed to him a thing anciently established by the agreement of the holy fathers, and confirmed by ancient doctors, with the custom also of a number of years, and, as he thought, according to the Scriptures. Wherefore he could not in conscience consent to the abolishing of them, and determined rather to lose all that ever he had, than to condemn his own conscience; with many other circumstances to that effect." Finally, the matter being well debated, it was thought good yet to give him two days' respite further to be advised, in hope he might reconcile himself, which if he did not upon his next answer, appointed to be upon Tuesday next, the council agreed to proceed ordinarily against him, as against a contemptuous person, by way of sequestration.

December 9. This day the bishop of Chichester appeared before the council, and being demanded whether he would obey the king's majesty's commandment in pulling down the altars, as is before rehearsed, he answered, "That he thanked both the king's majesty and his council, of their great clemency used towards him; but he said he could not by any means persuade himself to do that thing that was against his conscience. Wherefore he prayed them to do with him what they thought requisite; for he would never obey to do the thing that his conscience would not bear." Whereupon for his contempt he was, by the order of the whole council, committed to ward in the Fleet, till further order should be taken for him.

We hear no more of him and his fellow, the bishop of Worcester, till nine months hence. And so we leave them both in the Fleet till September 27, 1551. When we find Sir Roger Cholmely, Kt., Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Sir Richard Read, Richard Goodrich, John Gosnold, John Oliver, and Richard Ryel, being commissioners appointed by the king's majesty for the proceedings in the causes laid against these two bishops, were commanded, by letter from the council, to call the said bishops before them at Whitehall; and beginning with the bishop of Worcester's cause, to proceed also with Chichester, so as the judgment of the one might succeed the other, without any delay of time more than needed. And when the acts of the council proceeded in those causes should be requisite, the same, upon knowledge given thither, should be sent them; and in the mean time to use for their instruction the acts that were passed upon Worcester's cause, and those that Mr. Reid had already concerning Chichester; with admonition, seeing their contempts so evident, not to give them any long delay, by granting any learned counsel, or otherwise by such pretexts.

September 28, the council sent a letter to the lord chancellor, with the commission directed to the above-named persons, for the examination and determining of the bishops of Worcester and Chichester's causes; praying him to send the same to such of the council as are at or near London, whose hands be not thereto, that they might sign it; and then to seal it, and send it with a letter from the said lords, enclosed within his, to the said commissioners. According to these orders, within less than a month, these two bishops were at last deprived, after the expectation of their compliances a long while.

And October 24, 1551, the council sent a letter to the chancellor of the augmentations, to take immediate order for seizure in the king's majesty's hands of the temporalties of their bishoprics, lately given to his highness by the judgment passed by the commissioners, appointed for the hearing of those bishops' causes.

These bishops remained prisoners in the Fleet, after their deprivation, till the next summer; when, as it seems, for their health's sake, they desired to be removed to some place of better air and more liberty. Whereupon, June 15, 1552, Dr. Day was sent to [Goodrich,] the bishop of Ely, lord chancellor, and Dr. Heath to [Ridley,] the bishop of London, by the appointment of his majesty. And they were directed to use them as to Christian charity should be most seemly. At whose hands the king doubted not but they should receive such Christian advice as would tend to the glory of God. July 17, upon the motion of the bishop of London, the lords of the council were content that he should send Dr. Heath unto the bishop's own house at London [from Fulham;] to recover his health, and then to have him again. So far more kindly were these Popish bishops dealt withal in this reign, than the Protestant bishops were in the next. Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, succeeded in the see of Worcester; and Scory, bishop of Rochester, in that of Chichester.

I will here crave the reader's leave to insert two or three words concerning Bishop Day, thereby to judge the better of him.

About the year 1547, saying of masses was laid aside in King's College in Cambridge, the members of which college generally favoured the Gospel. Day, the provost thereof (which place he held *in commendam* with his bishopric), hearing of this, wrote an angry letter to the vice-provost, and in him to the whole college, for divers things which they had done relating to reformation; and particularly for leaving off saying masses. In which he said, "They departed from the institution of the house, and that they did it rashly, and besides the law, there being as yet no law for so doing. He charged them with the breach of statute, and so would involve them in the sin of perjury. And whereas in their public disputations they gave questions against Popish doctrines, he charged them with disputing wickedly and turbulently, to the wounding of tender consciences, and the infamy of the house. And finally, required that things should be put in the same posture they were before." To which the college, by Dr. Haddon's elegant pen, wrote an answer:[1] "That as to their abolishing masses, they said, they were private masses; and the statutes of the college did seem to enjoin only masses, wherein was a communion of the body and blood of Christ. That that was not perjury, when, by the common consent of the college, some minuter matters of the statutes were changed. That had he himself been there, he would have done as they did, considering the reports that came from the court, brought by witnesses worthy of credit. And that as for their disputations, they urged, that it was free for them to dispute matters controverted, for better inquiry into the truth; and that it was done with lenity, without any perverseness of speech."

He had a younger brother named William, who was above forty years after bishop of Winton. This man was a scholar of the college while his brother was provost and bishop; to whom he sent once a request, to supply him with a little money to buy him some books and other necessaries he stood in need of at that time. His brother answered him, knowing him to be well affected to the Gospel, "That for his part he held it not fit to relieve those that were not of the true church, and therefore he would not in any wise relieve him."[2] Thus had his religion destroyed in him the very principles of nature.

This bishop had been a vehement asserter of transubstantiation; yet in April 1550 he preached against it at Westminster, which King Edward thought fit to take notice of in his Journal; and he complied, and went along with all the steps of the Reformation till the declining of this year

---

[1] Haddoni Ep. p. 169.

[2] Hatcher's MS. Catal. of Provosts, &c. of King's Coll.

1550, when the matter of taking down altars was set on foot. For then it seems either there was a prospect that the Reformation, carrying on, would have a stop, or it was secretly agreed, among the popishly affected, now to fall off.

In Queen Mary's days he was a mighty busy man, and one of the commissioners for the examination and condemning to death [of] the professors of religion. When in conference with Bradford, that holy man had charged him for departing from the reformed church, as it was in King Edward's days; he told him, "that he was but a young man (and yet in the first year of that king he was five or six and forty years of age); and that, coming from the university, he went with the world; but it was always against his conscience."[1] He could, it seems, dispense with his conscience upon occasion; and yet what a man of conscience was he when altars were to be pulled down! He sat a commissioner upon Hooper, together with Winchester [Gardiner,] London [Bonner,] Durham [Tonstal,] and Landaff [Kitchen,] and, however gently he had been used in his trouble, that was forgot; and he treated that reverend man most rudely, undecently falling upon him with foul words, and with a scornful countenance calling him "hypocrite."[2]

CHAPTER XXI.

Papists grow bold. Loose professors restrained.

Thus, indeed, when the Papists found they could not prevail by outward force, which they had tried to the utmost the last year, they now used other arts. One among the rest was to libel the government, and disperse scurrilous rhymes and ballads upon the preachers. One of these was this year fastened upon the pulpit of some eminent church; probably of St. Paul's, which nevertheless soon had an answer to it. And not long after a more witty ballad was put abroad, glancing, as it seems, at the archbishop, upon occasion of the liberty of reading the Bible, and of the English Service, and the publishing the Homily-book, and other good books; whipping the government under the person of one John No-body, because that, notwithstanding all these religious pretences, there was so much sin, lechery, adultery, bribery, and want of charity. A taste of this their poetry I have put into the Appendix;[1] because some probably may be so curious as to peruse the fancy of that age.

---

[1] [Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vii. p. 176.]

[2] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 646.]

The Papists were at this juncture very bold; whether it were that they had taken up a conceit that the old religion would be again restored upon the disgrace of the duke of Somerset, or upon some other reasons. To stay these men, the council, as they had proceeded before against some Popish bishops, so they thought fit to use some rigours towards others, noted to be the forwardest men. One of these was Dr. Chedsey, who was one of the disputants against Peter Martyr, the king's professor.[2] He took now upon him to preach openly at Oxford against the steps of the Reformation that were made, and making. Wherefore, March 16, he was committed to the Marshalsea for seditious preaching, where he lay till November the 11th, 1551; and then he was ordered to be brought to the bishop of Ely's, where he enjoyed his table, and an easier restraint. March 19, Serjeant Morgan was committed to the Fleet for hearing mass in the Lady Mary's chapel. March 22, Sir Anthony Brown was committed to the Fleet for the same offence. And three days after, viz. March 25, Mr. White, warden of Winchester, appeared before the council, and confessed that he had divers books and letters from beyond sea, and namely, from one Martin, a scholar there, who opposed the king's majesty's proceedings utterly. And it being manifest that he had consented to things of that sort in such wise that greater practices were thought to be in him that ways, he was committed to the Tower; where lying for some months, he showed better conformity in matters of religion. So that in June 14, 1551, the council wrote a letter to the archbishop, that he should send to the lieutenant of the Tower for Mr. White to be brought to him, and with him to remain till such time as he should reclaim him. Which being done, he was to be sent back again to the Tower, until the king's majesty's further pleasure upon his lordship's certificate of his proceedings with him. This White, however he complied now, was in Queen Mary's reign made bishop successively of Lincoln and Winchester, and preached that queen's funeral sermon; and was deprived by the next queen for refusing conformity to the religion then established.

---

[1] No. XLIX.

[2] [See above, p. 289.]

And while the Papists on one hand were so busy in promoting their ends, there were a looser sort of professors of religion, [who] disgraced the Reformation on the other. For some there were that took the liberty of meeting together in certain places, and there to propound odd questions, and vent dangerous doctrines and opinions. Of these also the council having notice, they thought it very fit to discountenance and restrain them. January 27, a number of persons, a sort of Anabaptists, about sixty, met in a house on a Sunday, in the parish of Bocking, in Essex, where arose among them a great dispute, "Whether it were necessary to stand or kneel, barehead or covered, at prayers? And they concluded the ceremony not to be material, but that the heart before God was required, and nothing else." Such other-like warm disputes there were about Scripture. There were likewise such assemblies now in Kent. These were looked upon as dangerous to Church and State; and two of the company were therefore taken and committed to the Marshalsea; and orders were sent to apprehend the rest; viz. to Sir George Norton, sheriff of Essex, to apprehend and send up to the council those persons that were assembled for Scripture matters in Bocking; nine of them were named, being cowherds, clothiers, and such-like mean people. The like order was sent to Sir Edward Wotton, and to Sir Thomas Wyat, to apprehend others of them, seven whereof are named, living in Kent. February 3, those that were apprehended for the meeting at Bocking appeared before the council, and confessed the cause of their assembly to be, "For to talk of the Scriptures; that they had refused the communion for above two years, and that, as was judged, upon very superstitious and erroneous purposes; with divers other evil opinions, worthy of great punishment." Whereupon five of them were committed; and seven of them were bound in recognizance to the king in forty pounds each man. The condition, to appear when they should be called upon, and to resort to their ordinaries for resolution of their opinions, in case they had any doubt in religion.

CHAPTER XXII.

Foreigners allowed Churches. A Lasco.

We shall now show a remarkable instance of the archbishop's episcopal piety, in the care he took of the souls of foreigners, as well as of the native English. For in King Edward's reign there were great numbers of strangers in the realm—French, Dutch, Italians, Spaniards, who abode here upon divers occasions; some for trade and commerce, and some, no doubt, to be secret spies, and promoters of the Pope's affairs, and to hinder the propagation of the religion; but the most were such as fled over either to escape the persecutions that were in those times very violently set on foot in their respective countries, and to enjoy the liberty of their consciences, and the free profession of their religion. Our prelate had a chief hand in forming these strangers into distinct congregations for the worship of God, and in procuring them convenient churches to meet in, and setting preachers of their own over them, to instruct them in the true religion; Cecil and Cheke joining with him in this pious design, and furthering it at court with the king and duke of Somerset. And this they did both out of Christian charity and Christian policy too; this being a probable means to disperse the Reformed religion into foreign parts; that when any of these strangers, or their children, should return into their own country, they might carry the tincture of religion along with them, and sow the seeds of it in the hearts of their countrymen.

This year the German or Dutch congregation began under Johannes à Lasco, a nobleman of Poland, styled their superintendent; and this by the favour and influence of our archbishop, who had entertained him in his family with respect due to his quality and great piety. This person had forsaken his country and honours for the sake of the Gospel, and became a preacher to a Protestant congregation at Embden, in East Friezland. But seeing all things look black and stormy round about him, and tending to a persecution, he took an opportunity to embark for England; where, being a person not only of honour, but of great learning and piety, and withal an exile for the sake of Christ, and voluntarily taking up the ministry out of zeal to promote the Gospel, he met with a very honourable and friendly reception, and soon became acquainted with many eminent persons here: as with Dr. Turner, the duke of Somerset's physician, and dean of Wells; Sir John Cheke, Sir William Cecil, and our archbishop; and, by their means, with the duke of Somerset himself. His chief business here seemed to be, to make some provision for himself and his congregation, in case of persecution. For this purpose he got a conference with the said duke, a way, as it seems, being made thereunto by the archbishop; requesting that he and his congregation might have leave to transplant themselves to London, that they might have a church here, and certain privileges likewise; moving the protector thereunto by arguments as well taken from charity as policy, namely, that hereby a trade and gainful manufacture would be introduced into England. He desired, therefore, that they might be incorporated by the king's letters patent, and that some old dissolved church or monastery might be granted to them, to worship and serve God in. When he had done this, he desired a certain Italian friend of his to acquaint Cecil with the sum of his discourse with the protector; and so, taking an opportunity on a sudden of passing again to Embden along with some ambassador, that was going into those parts, he took his leave to England; leaving the archbishop and Cecil to second his business with the duke as occasion should serve. Being at Yarmouth, before his going abroad, he wrote to Cecil his full mind, in case he and his congregation should be driven away. He desired him, "that if he should understand anything concerning his call into England, or would be informed by him of any other matters, that he would convey his letters unto one Robert Legat, an Englishman, living at Embden, who would communicate them unto him."

Being arrived at Embden, he writ to the archbishop, relating all passages that he knew concerning the state of affairs, and particularly of religion in those parts, desiring him to impart them to the protector. He writ also unto Cecil, his letter bearing date in April, 1549, referring him to the protector's letters; and withal acquainting him in what a ticklish and dangerous condition they were. "That they certainly expected the cross; that they did mutually exhort one another to bear it, with invocation upon God's holy name; that by patience and faith they might overcome all whatsoever God should permit to be done against them, to the glory of His name, or for their trial. They were sure He had a care of them, and that He was so powerful, that He could in a moment, by a word of His mouth, dash in pieces all the forces of their enemies, whatsoever they were. And that He was so good, that He would not suffer so much as an hair, without cause, to fall from their head, although the whole world should make an assault upon them. And that He could no more wish them harm than a mother could her own infant, or any one the apple of his own eye; yea, no more than He Himself could not be God, who was to be praised in all things whatsoever happened to them, since He permitted nothing to fall out to them but for their good; and so, for their welfare. And that therefore they committed themselves wholly to Him, and did expect with all toleration whatsoever He should allow to be done to them." In this pious manner did à Lasco write to Cecil; and no doubt in the same tenour to the archbishop. This made a very great impression upon the godly hearts of them both, and caused them vigorously to use their interest with the protector to provide a safe retreat for him and his congregation, which was obtained for them soon after. His whole letter, in a handsome Latin style, as some memorial of him, I have reposited in the Appendix.[1]

Latimer also made way for his reception, who, in one of his sermons before King Edward, made honourable mention of him, using an argument proper for that audience, namely, how much it would tend to the bringing down God's blessing on the realm, to receive him, and such pious exiles as he. "John à Lasco was here a great learned man, and, as they say, a nobleman in his country, and is gone his way again. If it be for lack of entertainment, the more pity. I could wish such men as he to be in the realm; for the realm should prosper in receiving of them. 'He that receiveth you receiveth me,' said Christ. And it should be for the king's honour to receive them and keep them."[1]

---

[1] No. L.

It was but a little after the king had received this congregation of foreigners into England, and had granted them a church, viz. St. Augustin's, but great contest happened among them about their church, yielded them for their religious worship. This P. Martyr took notice of with grief to Bucer; and added, "that their minds were so implacable to one another, that the difference was fain to be referred to the privy council to make an end of."[2] But not to leave our superintendent yet.

À Lasco with his strangers being settled at London, and incorporated by the king's patents, being their chief pastor, and a stirring man, was very industrious to procure and maintain the liberties and benefits of his church. The members thereof had planted themselves chiefly in St. Katharine's, and in Great and Little Southwark. Here they were now and then called upon by the churchwardens of their respective parishes to resort to their parish churches: though the ministers themselves did not appear in it. In the month of November, anno 1552, some of these strangers, inhabiting the parts of Southwark, were again troubled by their churchwardens, and threatened with imprisonment, unless they would come to church. Whereupon their superintendent, à Lasco, applied himself to the lord chancellor, who then was Goodrich, bishop of Ely. By the way one might inquire, why he resorted not rather to his friend and patron the archbishop of Canterbury. But the reason may soon be guessed, namely, that after the fall of Somerset, the archbishop's good friend, he came not so often to court, or transacted business there, unless sent for; knowing his interest likewise to be but little with the duke of Northumberland, who now bare all the sway, and who had a jealous eye of him, as he had of all Somerset's friends. And so the archbishop might have rather hindered than forwarded à Lasco's business, if he had appeared in it. But this *en passant*. The chancellor gently received à Lasco, and dismissing him, sent him to secretary Cecil with this message, to get him to propound the business the next day in the afternoon at the council-board, when himself should be there; promising him likewise, that he would be assistant to him in procuring him a warrant in writing, to be directed to all ministers and churchwardens of the parishes of Southwark and St. Katharine's, that for the time to come the strangers of this congregation should receive no molestation in that regard any more. Accordingly à Lasco the next morning sent one of the elders of his church to Cecil with his letter, excusing himself that he came not, being grievously afflicted with a pain in his head. Therein he acquainted him with the sum of his conference with the lord chancellor; adding, that the obtaining such a warrant would be necessary for them to produce and show to such as at that present did annoy them, and to be hereafter kept by the church; that they might not be forced at other times, upon the like occasions, to create new trouble to the king's council, or himself, in suing for new warrants of that nature. Meaning hereby to put the secretary upon drawing this up the more formally and substantially. And so, entreating him to hear what the elder had to say, and to despatch him, he took his leave. This letter also is inserted in the Appendix.[1]

---

[1] Third Sermon before the king, anno 1549. [See Parker Society's edition of Bp. Latimer's Works, vol. i. p. 141.]

[2] MSS. of Benet College, [C.C.C.C. MSS. No. 119, fol. 106. See also Appendix, No. lxi. vol. ii. of this edition (P. Martyr's Letter to Bucer)].

The superintendence of à Lasco seemed to extend not only to this particular congregation of Germans, but over all the other churches of foreigners set up in London, as also over their schools of learning and education. They were all subject to his inspection, and within his jurisdiction. And Melancthon,[2] in an epistle to him in the month of September, 1551, speaks of the purity of doctrine "in his churches." His condition now, as to worldly circumstances, began to be so good, that he was able to relieve and succour such learned foreigners as should retire thither. For when one Nicolas Forst, a learned and grave man, who had lived long in the university of Louvaine, and had spent some time with Melancthon, was minded, for the sake of religion, to convey himself into England; he recommended him earnestly to the superintendent, as a person fit to teach in his churches and schools; and that he would friendly entertain him as an exile, for the same cause himself was, and find him some little nest to remain in. Nay, and the said Melancthon himself had some thoughts of sheltering himself under à Lasco here, as appears by the forementioned letter, wherein he styles him his patron; for the superscription of his letter is thus: "Illustri, magnifico, ac reverendo viro, nobilitate generis, virtute et sapientia præstanti Dn. Johanni à Lasco, patrono suo colendo." So much of deference and honour did learned and pious men then use to give him. In this letter Melancthon told him, that the calamities of the churches were great, and that he himself expected banishment, and might probably in a short time arrive where he was. And in respect of his hospitable reception of strangers, he told him, that he believed he did often remember that saying of the exiled queen, "Non ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco."

---

[1] No. LI.

[2] Melancthon's Epistles, printed at Leyden, 1647, [pp. 321, 2, 3].

Nor was à Lasco any ways unfurnished for this spiritual government, being a man of good learning, and of great piety, strictness, and gravity from his younger age; and of whom the great Erasmus himself acknowledged that he learned much. For in his epistle to Johannes à Lasco, the archbishop of Gnesne, who was namesake and uncle to our superintendent, he speaks thus of his nephew: "That he was but young, yet grave beyond his years; and that he himself accounted it none of the least parts of his happiness, that he happened to have his converse and society for some months:" praising the endowments that God had given him; and particularly concerning the benefits he received by him, he could not but confess, "Senex juvenis convictu factus sum melior, ac sobrietatem, verecundiam, linguæ moderationem, modestiam, pudicitiam, integritatem, quam juvenis a sene discere debuerat, a juvene senex didici." "That by the conversation of that young man, he, an old man, became better; and that sobriety, temperance, awfulness, government of the tongue, modesty, chastity, integrity, which the young ought to learn of the old, he, an old man, had learned of a young."[1] This he wrote in August, 1527, soon after à Lasco was gone from him. And in June the same year, while he resided with him, in another letter to Leonard Cox, a learned Englishman, he signified the great complacency he took in his company. "Johannis à Lasco tale sum expertus ingenium—ut vel hoc uno amico mihi videar satis beatus." "That he had found à Lasco's parts to be such, that he seemed happy enough in his single friendship."[2]

And this good understanding continued between them as long as Erasmus lived. For à Lasco seems to have been with him in his last sickness; when, as the last token of Erasmus' esteem of him, he made a purchase to him of his own library (that incomparable treasure), if we may believe the author of his life in English.[3]

À Lasco thought not the clergy obliged to celibacy, or single life; for he himself was a married man. Who his wife was I know not; but as for her qualities, she was in all probability a pious and discreet woman, whereby she gained a great share in his affections. He styled her "the other part of himself." But in August, 1552, God deprived him of her. Which stroke put him for some time under much sadness and indisposition both of mind and body, as appears by one of his letters.

He was alive at the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the English throne; and though he came not back then to England again, whence he departed upon King Edward's death, yet, according to that great interest he had here with the most eminent persons, and even the queen herself, he neglected not by his letters to promote the Reformation, and to give his grave counsel in order thereunto. And Zanchy, public professor at Strasburg, knowing the sway he bare here, in a letter to him in the year 1558 or 59, excited him in these words: "Non dubito, quin T. P. jamdudum scripserit ad reginam, eique consuluerit quæ pro illius regni conservatione, et regni Christi instauratione facienda judicarit," &c. "That he doubted not he had before now written to the queen, and given her his advice, what he judged fit to be done for the preservation of her kingdom, and for the restoring of the kingdom of Christ. Yet he would not omit to pray him to do it again and again by his repeated letters. For I know," said he, "how great your authority is with the English, and with the queen herself. Now certainly is the time that you, and such as you be, should by your counsels help so pious a queen, and consult for the safety of so great a kingdom, yea, and succour the whole Christian Church, everywhere afflicted and vexed. For we know that if Christ's kingdom be happily introduced into the kingdom of England, no small aid will thence come to all the other churches dispersed through Germany, Poland, and other countries."[1]

---

[1] Ep. iii. lib. xxviii.

[2] Ep. xv. lib. xix.

[3] [Fuller's] Abel Rediviv[us ; Life of Erasmus, p. 77].

There is one thing that is wont to be urged against him, and which makes him to this day to be somewhat ill thought of; which was, that he opposed himself so openly, by writing against the habits prescribed the clergy, and the posture of kneeling at the reception of the holy sacrament; whereby he incurred the censure of a meddling temper, and of ingratitude to that nation that so kindly had entertained him. Concerning the habits, Bucer and he had some controversy. The sum of which, on both parts, Archbishop Parker drew up (upon the desire, I suppose, of Sir William Cecil), about the year 1565, when that controversy was hotly renewed again by Humfrey and Sampson. This sum whosoever is minded to see, may probably hereafter find it in the memorials of that archbishop, if God grant life and opportunity to me to write them.

About this time, viz. in the year 1550 or 1551, there was also a church of Italians constituted in London, by the influence and care of our archbishop and Sir William Cecil, under à Lasco's superintendence. This church consisted of divers Italian nations, as Florentines, Genoeses, Milanois, Venetians, and others; though several of them joined themselves with this congregation more out of worldly ends than conscience, as will appear afterward. For they had a kindness for the mass, and could not endure to hear the Pope's supremacy called in question, and inveighed against. One Michael Angelo Florio, a Florentine by birth, was appointed their preacher; probably brother, or kinsman, unto Simon Florio, preacher at the city of Clavenna among the Rhætii, an eminent professor of the Gospel in those parts, who wrote a letter to Gratalorius, an Italian physician, concerning two whole towns in Calabria, utterly destroyed by reason of the rigour of persecution exercised there; and about eight hundred or a thousand of the inhabitants put to death, because they professed the Gospel. Which letter is extant in Fox, in his table of the Italian martyrs.[1]

---

[1] [Zanchii Opera, tom. viii. p. 360.]

For the encouragement of this congregation, the archbishop procured the members of it to be free denizens, to live and traffic here with as much freedom as natural English subjects, which they were admitted to by swearing fidelity and allegiance. For their more easy and convenient dwelling here, they often petitioned the king for new privileges and immunities, as they saw they needed them; and such favour and countenance was shown them, that they seldom failed of their suits. The archbishop also, that their preacher might be provided for, dealt with the congregation, and made them oblige themselves to provide him with all necessaries—as a dwelling, and a competent yearly salary. In the year 1552, Michael Angelo sued again to our archbishop for some favour to be obtained from the king; whether it were for the better establishment of his church, or for some further immunities to be granted to the members thereof, it doth not appear. But this the most reverend man really furthered, by writing in that behalf to the duke of Northumberland from his house at Ford, near Canterbury, the duke being, I suppose, with the king in progress at this time. He likewise despatched another, dated November 20, the year abovesaid, to the secretary, entreating him to forward that cause as much as lay in him.

But however serviceable this their minister had been unto these Italians, in preaching the Gospel to them, and soliciting the archbishop for their benefit, yet many of them carried themselves but little obliging to him. Whether it were some misbehaviour or imprudences in him, which he was not altogether void of, or his too violent declaiming against the Pope and Popish doctrines, which they were not yet enough ripened in evangelical knowledge to receive, or that he too roughly charged them with the hardness of their hearts, and backwardness to receive Gospel truths, as he did use to do; but many of them wholly withdrew from him, and went to mass again. His contribution also fell very low, not having received above five pounds in a considerable time from them. Hereupon he resorted to the secretary, "making heavy complaints of his own poverty, that many of his people had forsaken his assembly, spake very slanderously against him and his ministry, and the Gospel which he preached, after they saw and heard him in an open manner preaching against the Pope's doctrines, tyranny, and hypocrisy, and reproving them for their unbelief, and the hardness of their hearts." The too much vehemency and passion of this man, and his neglect of informing the judgments of these Italians in milder and more leisurely methods, I suspect to have been a great cause of this apostasy.

---

[1] [Acts and Monuments, vol. iv. p. 472.]

But, upon this complaint, the secretary bade the pastor send him a list of the names of those that had thus behaved themselves, and that he himself would call them before him, and discourse with them. Accordingly he sent the names of fourteen in a letter to the said secretary, without aggravating to him their misbehaviour, and informing of their daily going to mass; and adding, that therefore they, being free denizens, and so subject to the English laws, ought to be punished as any Englishman would be if he heard mass. He quoted a place or two in Deuteronomy, where those that rebelled against God, the laws, and the judges, should be slain without mercy. He subjoined, that Elisha, by God's command, anointed Jehu to be king for this very purpose, that he should wholly root out the house of Ahab, and kill all the priests of Baal, and thence makes his uncharitable conclusion (more agreeable to the religion that he was so hot against), that therefore these Italians should be so served, since they opposed the Gospel, and the king's pious proceedings. But it might make one apt not to think over favourably of this man; a pastor, thus to turn accuser of his flock; a professor of the Reformed religion to require the utmost rigour of punishment for differing in religion.

I also find the morals of this man tainted, having once made a very foul slip, being guilty of an act of uncleanness;

for which Sir William Cecil, secretary of state, who had been his good friend, was exceedingly displeased with him, and withdrew all favour and countenance from him, calling him "wicked man," and intending to inflict some severe punishment upon him; which seemed to be banishment out of the nation, or at least turning him out of his family, where he seems to have been entertained. Angelo wrote him a very penitent letter, minding him of the frailty of human nature, and of the mercy of God to Moses, Aaron, David, Jonas, Peter, after their falls; and that if he were forced to depart the kingdom, he must either be compelled to renounce the truth of the Gospel, or have his blood shed by the enemies thereof. This was, as I suppose, in the year 1551. In fine, he got over this brunt, and recovered mild Cecil's favour; for I find, a year after, our archbishop wrote to him to further a certain business of Michael Angelo at court, as much as he could.

This is all I have to say of that Italian congregation, and the minister thereof. For further memory of which, I have added in the Appendix[1] two letters of this Michael Angelo to Secretary Cecil, whence many of the matters next above mentioned, were collected.

As there was thus a German and Italian church in London, so also there was a third of Frenchmen, under à Lasco's superintendency. One member of which, a very honest man, and of sound religion, by the general testimony of that church, had desired to set up a printing-house for his livelihood, chiefly for printing the Liturgy, and other books of the Church of England, in French, for the use of the French islands under the English subjection. In whose behalf the superintendent readily interceded by a letter with the secretary to procure the king's letters patent, for his license and authority so to do. The issue of which will be seen in the progress of this history. The letter I have transcribed to accompany two others of à Lasco in the Appendix.[2]

---

[1] Nos. LII. LIII.

[2] No. LIV.

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Church at Glastonbury.

In the same year, viz. 1550, another church of strangers, and they mostwhat French and Walloons, began to settle at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire. They were weavers, and followed the manufacture of kerseys, and cloth of that nature, as I conjecture. Their great patrons were the duke of Somerset and Sir William Cecil; I add, and our archbishop, though I did not find his name mentioned in the papers I make use of, relating to this church; for there is no question but that his counsel and aid concurrred in the settlement of this church, as well as those in London; and particularly as to the preacher, whom I suspect to have been one of those learned foreign divines whom he harboured in his own house. His name was Valerandus Pollanus, a man of great worth both for learning and integrity, who had the title of superintendent of the strangers' church at Glastonbury, as John à Lasco had of that at London; given to each to fix a character of honour and esteem upon their persons, and perhaps to exempt them and their churches from the jurisdiction of the bishops of those respective dioceses. This Pollanus turned into Latin, and printed, the disputations held in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, between the Protestants and Papists at the Convocation, anno 1553. If any desire to know the particular state and condition of the establishment of these strangers, as to their trade, it stood thus.

Pollanus, in behalf of the rest, had preferred a petition to the duke of Somerset, and the rest of the lords of the council, to this effect; "That they might be permitted to form themselves into a church for the free exercise of religion, and to follow peaceably their calling of weaving; declaring, as an argument to persuade them to allow the same, the considerable benefit that would accrue thence to the realm; and that for shops and working-houses, and for reception of them and their families, they might enjoy some old dissolved religious house." Their petition was condescended to, and the duke, being a great cherisher of those of the religion, resolved to be their patron, and to take the managing of this whole cause upon himself. The duke, in the month of June this year, had made an exchange of certain lands with the king, and that probably for the better accommodating of these strangers. He had parted with the castle and lordship of Sleaford, and other lands and tenements in the county of Lincoln, to the king; and the king had granted him, in lieu thereof, all and singular his messuages, lands, tenements, and hereditaments, with their appurtenances, in the town of Glastonbury (namely, what had belonged to the abbey), and other lands and tenements in Kingston-upon-Hull, to the value of 214*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.* obq., as I find in a manuscript book, mentioning the several sales that king made. Having obtained such conveniences in Glastonbury, he resolved to plant this manufacture here, which he thought would tend so much to the benefit of the country, himself, and these poor strangers too. Conditions were mutually entered into.

The conditions on Somerset's part were, "That he should provide them houses convenient for their occupations, and to contain themselves and families; that five acres of pasture land, or as much as would serve for the feeding of two cows throughout the year, should be allotted to each of them; and until land were so allotted, they should enjoy the park in common for the said use, with some part also of the gardens. They were also to be supplied with moneys from the duke to buy wool, and defray other charges necessary to set them on work. They were also empowered to employ both English men and women, as they should have occasion, in spinning, and other works belonging to their trade." And so accordingly they went down to Glastonbury, and fell to work.

But upon the troubles and fall of Somerset, which happened about fourteen or fifteen months after, their affairs were much obstructed. His servants neglected to furnish them with money according to contract, nor was he at leisure now to regard them. The people among whom they lived, took this opportunity to express what little kindness they had for them; it being the temper of the common sort to be jealous of strangers, and rude to them. So that they were not without their discontents and discouragements; for they wanted those conveniences of room for workhouses and habitations, that were promised them. They ran in debt, and were forced to lay to pawn the clothes they had wove, to supply their wants. Cornish, one of the chief of their procurators, appointed to oversee them, and further their trade, proved very deceitful and false to them; who came to them, pretending letters from the council, and treating them at first with fair words, and after with threatenings; and so compelled them to deliver the clothes that they had made to him, though they had by mere necessity been forced to pawn them. He had also, by his importunity and fraud got the grant of the park from them, though he knew the duke had fully purposed and intended it for their use, for the necessary maintenance of themselves and families.

Things being in this ill condition with them, and Somerset no longer able to befriend them, they were glad to apply again to those above. Pollanus therefore, in their behalf, petitioned the lords of the council to take their declining state into their consideration, and to carry on that good work the duke of Somerset had begun. He did also ply the secretary to further their petition (who was indeed of his own accord their most hearty friend); and laboured particularly with all earnestness imaginable, both by word of mouth, and by divers letters, to get the factory discharged of Cornish, urging that the weavers had never found the least grain of integrity, justice, or candour in him. This man was now very industrious and busy at court to get himself continued in his office; which the strangers understanding, were as diligent to get themselves delivered of him. The superintendent had but a little before despatched to the secretary one Peter Wolf, a good man, and a great sufferer, a Brabanter by nation, to relate the evil deeds of this man; and now again he despatched Stephen Le Provost, a deacon of his church, with another message to the same import to the said secretary, telling him, "That those, who were to be set over others, ought themselves in the first place to be honest and just; but especially they ought to be so in the highest degree that were to be placed over such good men, and who were exiles only for the sake of Christ;

unless any could be willing that such upright men should be undone, and that those very considerable advantages that were likely to accrue to the commonwealth by them should be diverted to some other place or country. That they could not enough wonder with what forehead this man should attempt this thing, after he had so plainly betrayed his base treachery and ill-will towards them; and could not but know how very hardly they could away with him, and who were going to sue to the duke for that which they now desired. That himself was solicited by the prayers of those good men to write this to him, that he would be their advocate with the lords in this behalf."

The result was, that the lords consented to uphold and encourage them, and sent down their letters to the overseers of this manufacture, and to the chief officers of the town, Powis, one of the king's servants, and Hyett, the chief magistrate, and others, to examine into the present state of these strangers, and to give them in writing an account thereof. These letters the superintendent delivered to them; and one Clark, a justice of peace, was then present, who being a gentleman and a scholar, that understood both French and Latin, did, out of his good-will to them, interpret to the rest Pollanus' petition to the lords of the council, and the contents of their contract with the duke of Somerset, and other matters relating to this business, that so they might be the better acquainted with their affairs, and it might appear there were no neglects or breaches of covenants on the strangers' parts. And so letters were despatched back to the lords from the overseers, signifying how they had examined the affairs of these strangers, and had found all things fair and just on their side; mentioning likewise what considerable commodity they hoped for by them: and likewise from the chief of the town to the same import.

Speedily upon this, orders came down from the lords to certain gentlemen of the town and neighbourhood, whereof one Dyer was one, a person of good religion, and their cordial friend, commissioning them to set this manufacture forward, and to take care the undertakers might be relieved in what they needed, according to their former contract with the duke. So they obtained the use of the park for the running of threescore head of kine, till other pasture were provided them. Thirty houses were ordered to be forthwith repaired and fitted up for them, and money was paid sufficient for the clearing them of their debts. These gentlemen had also assigned them a stated provision of money for the future, but it was too scanty; the allowance that they had proportioned them for two months would scarcely hold out for five weeks. Nor was any wool at all bought for their use, though their stock was almost at an end; and then their work must stand still for want thereof, having no money themselves to purchase more; and to take it up upon credit would enhance the price thereof. For one Crouch had demanded of them thirty-two shillings for wool, when they could buy it of their neighbours for four-and-twenty, had they money. Their only hope was in Dyer, who promised them wool at a far more reasonable rate, and kindly offered them a long day of payment for it, without consideration for forbearance: their doubt only was, whether his wool was proper for their use. But the interest of Cornish was such, that he was continued by the lords in his office over these tradesmen, and enjoyed a part of the park to himself. These things were transacted in the month of November, anno 1551, which was the month after the duke's commitment.

In all this affair Pollanus was very much employed, taking a great deal of pains in settling this trade; for he took many journeys between Glastonbury and the court, and was, as himself wrote, at incredible expenses, and in fifteen months' space received not an halfpenny, though he had a large family to maintain. The office also of surveying the reparation of the houses lay upon him; and, fearing the lords of the council might be displeased at the greatness of the charge they had been at already in the repairs, and the little profit that as yet arose to quit the cost, he entreated the secretary that he would bear up their reputation with the lords; telling him, "That he doubted not that the project would hereafter redound much to their own praise, by reason of the very great emolument that all men should perceive would come to the realm thereby within three years, God prospering them, as he had begun to do. And for himself, all he desired was, that for all his charge and trouble he might obtain a stipend of fifty pounds to be settled upon him." The letters of Valerandus Pollanus, being three in number, I have inserted in the Appendix.[1]

I acknowledge, that many of these things I have related concerning this business, may seem too little and minute for an historian to take notice of. But I was loth any particulars of so remarkable a design should be lost, which in probability would have turned so much to the benefit of our nation. It being also an instance of the pious care and good policy that was then taken by the court for the relief and sustentation of poor fugitives, flying thither from their native country, friends, and livelihood, for Christ's sake; and yet that the public might be as little burdened by them as might be.

Queen Mary's access to the crown spoiled this good design. For all strangers being then commanded suddenly to depart the realm, this congregation accordingly brake up, and removed themselves to Frankfort, in Germany, where the magistrates kindly entertained them, and allowed them a church. And when afterwards, viz. 1554, divers of the English nation fled thither for their religion, the governors of the town, upon their petition, received them also, and all other such English as should resort thither upon the same account, as many did. And two members of this French congregation, mindful undoubtedly of the former kindness themselves or their countrymen had received in England, assisted them much; namely, Morellio a minister, and Castalio an elder. The English here made use of the same church the French did; these one day, and the English another; and upon Sundays the use of it respectively, as themselves could agree.

And as there were settled here congregations of French, Italians, and Dutch strangers, so I am very apt to believe there was also a church of Spaniards too. Indeed I do not find express mention of any such till the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, when Cassiodorus and Anthonius Corranus Hispalensis [of Seville] (a member of the Italian congregation), were their preachers, of whom I shall have occasion to say something in my memorials of Archbishop Grindal. It is certain, that in Queen Mary's days many of those Spaniards, who came over in the retinue of Philip, the Spanish prince, or after, forsook Popery, and became professors of the Reformed religion, which one cannot well tell how it should come to pass, unless it were by the hearing of the Gospel preached in their own language here. And it is observable, that among these many had been sent for over, in that queen's time, to convert our nation from heresy, as they termed it, and to reduce it to the Roman Church. This notable success and power, which the clear evidence of truth had upon these men, was in those times taken much notice of, as it might well be. James Pilkington, the master of St. John's College in Cambridge, and who was afterwards bishop of Durham, makes a note of it to the university, in the sermon which he preached at the restitution of Bucer and Fagius, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, after the barbarous indignities that had been offered them in the former queen's reign, in raking their dead bodies out of their graves, and burning them. "It is much more notable," said he, "that we have seen to come to pass in our days, that the Spaniards, sent for into the realm on purpose to suppress the Gospel, as soon as they were returned home, replenished many parts of their country with the same truth of religion, to the which before they were utter enemies."[1]

---

[1] Nos. LV. LVI. LVII.

Nay, and not long after this, such earnest professors of the true religion were found in Spain, that many of them endured the fiery trial, and offered up their bodies to the flames, for Christ's sake; and more were cast into prisons; and yet the Gospel got ground there to admiration; as Zanchy gave a relation thereof to à Lasco in one of his letters; wherein he spake of the great numbers of true professors in Italy also. The place being so much to our present purpose, I will take leave to lay before the reader. "In Calabriæ duobus castellis, &c."—"In two castles of Calabria, one belonging to the duke of Montalto, the other to a nobleman of Naples, were found 4,000 brethren, being the remainders of those brethren called Waldenses. They were for many years unknown, and lived safely in their ancestors' possessions. For though they approved not of masses, yet they thought the faithful might go to them with a safe conscience. But being untaught this bad doctrine, they did wholly and universally abstain going any more. And so it came to pass, that they could not be concealed any longer; therefore a persecution was raised up against them. They writ to the brethren at Geneva to assist them by their prayers, their counsel, and also by human aid. We see also in Italy, where the seat of Antichrist is, there is a great harvest; but very few to gather it. O God, have mercy upon Italy. In Spain very many were burnt, more cast into prison. Nevertheless, in the mean time, the Gospel goes forward, as we hear, wonderfully."[1] And in another letter he writes thus: "There is a very great persecution in Italy, nor a less in Spain—a sign there be many faithful there that dare confess Christ."[2]

---

[1] [Bucer. Script. Anglic. p. 942.]

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Archbishop's Care of the Revenues of the Church. Bucer dies.

I RETURN now to our prelate again, to take a further view of him, acting in his high function in the English Church. It must not be omitted to be ranked among his good services towards it, that he did what in him lay to preserve the revenues of it in his time, when there were so many hungry courtiers gaping after them. These were again in a new danger after the duke of Northumberland and his party had removed Somerset, and made themselves the great controllers of public affairs.

It was indeed the scandal of the Reformation, that the demesnes that had been settled long before by our pious ancestors for the maintenance of God's ministers, as they had been formerly wrongfully appropriated to monasteries, and swallowed up by lazy monks, so they had not now recurred and been restored to their true owners, but became possessed by laymen; so that in many scores of parishes there remained not sufficient to buy bread for the incumbents and their families. And it was more than suspicious that many patrons did render the condition of the Church still worse in these days by retaining and reserving to themselves, whether by contract or power, the tithes of the benefices they presented to; and by these means pluralities and non-residences, the old mischief of the Church, were not redressed, but rather made necessary. This abuse grieved good men, and lovers of the Reformation, both at home and abroad, because they saw how the preaching of the Gospel was obstructed hereby.

---

[1] Zanchii Ep. lib. ii. [tom. viii. p. 360].

[2] [Id. tom. viii. p. 359.]

Concerning this, Bucer from Cambridge wrote privately to Calvin in the year 1550. And this made Calvin address a letter to our archbishop, telling him, that, for the flourishing state of religion, he thought it highly needful to have fit pastors, that might seriously set themselves to perform the office of preaching. One great obstacle whereof he makes very truly to be, "Quod prædæ expositi sunt Ecclesiæ reditus;"—"That the rents of the Church were exposed to be a prey," which he calls "malum sane intolerabile."[1] And of the same thing, and not long after, viz. July 1551, he admonished the duke of Somerset in a French letter, all of his own handwriting; which because of the antiquity of it, and the matter it treats of referring to our Church, and not being among his printed epistles, I have added in the Appendix.[2] In which letter he excites the duke to take care that there might be fit and able ministers fixed in parishes to teach the people; the want whereof he attributed to two causes. The one whereof he made to lie in the universities; and the other in the matter that we are speaking of. "That the revenue of the cures was withdrawn and dispersed away; so that there was nothing to maintain good men, who were fit to perform the office of true pastors. And hence it came to pass that ignorant priests were put in, which made great confusion; for the quality of the persons begat great contempt of God's word. Advising the duke to endeavour to bring those that had these spiritual possessions, to be willing to part with them; inasmuch as they could not prosper in defrauding God's people of their spiritual food, which they did by hindering the churches of good pastors."

Bucer, the king's divinity professor at Cambridge, was this year engaged in a public disputation; as his colleague, Peter Martyr, the king's professor at Oxon, had been there the last. Before this disputation happened, Bucer communicated his purpose to his said colleague and friend, who, having sufficient experience of the vain-glorious ends of the Papists in these kinds of disputations, and of their unfair dealings, advised him in a letter not to engage in it, but to decline it. On which letter Archbishop Parker, into whose hands it fell, wrote this inscription:—"Ad Bucerum, prudens Martyris consilium, ut non det se in disputatione cum gloriosulis Thrasonibus."[1] But it seems he was too far engaged to avoid it with reputation, nor thought he fit to do it for the vindication and sake of truth. The questions disputed of, and his antagonists, were before mentioned. It seems he came off with great credit; for his friend Martyr, in a letter to him, soon after it was over, professed a great deal of gladness that his disputations had that good success; and that it so well happened was by God's providence: which, he said, he could scarce have believed to have been a thing possible, without visitors, or other grave judges; since the Papists reckoned it enough for their business only to dispute, afterwards studiously dispersing their lies, to their own advantage, and the disparagement of those that disputed against them. And therefore, Martyr said, he wondered not that Christ in the beginning confirmed the disputations of His Apostles with miracles.

---

[1] Ep. 127.

[2] No. LVIII.

November 9, Bucer began a learned reading of the power and use of the ministry, but lived not to finish it; for the latter end of this year put an end to this learned man's life, of whose counsel and advice our archbishop made great use in the steps he made for reformation of religion. He made his will before he left Strasburg, but the codicil to that will he added February 22, a few days before his death, wherein he left to his wife to take the advice of Mr. Bradford, and the minister of Allhallows, for ordering of his burial, and constituted two eminent men of that university his executors; namely, Dr. Matthew Parker, who was afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Walter Haddon, after master of requests to Queen Elizabeth, and both of them adorned his funerals the one with an English sermon before the university, and the other with a Latin oration, being university orator, both which are extant in print. He died but poor, and seemed to be in some want of necessaries in his last sickness; for there is a short letter, in a scrawling hand, which I have seen, wrote by him to the aforesaid Parker, then master of Benet College, and his great friend, to lend him ten crowns, which because it was the last letter, I believe, he ever wrote, and but short, I shall here insert:—

---

[1] MSS. C.C.C.C. [No. 119, fol. 105].

> "S. D. Oro D. T. Clarissime D. Doctor, ut des mihi X coronatos mutuo, uno tantum mense. Reddam bona fide. Opt. vale.
>
> "D. T. deditiss. in Dno.
>
> "Martinus Bucerus manu perægre propria."

Under which is writ by Dr. Parker, out of the honour he had for his memory, "Scriptum novissimum omnium quod scripsit D. Bucerus, paulo ante mortem ejus."[1]

Bucer's friends, after they had taken care for giving him an honourable funeral, consulted the supply of his widow, Wibrand Bucerin, that she might be well gratified, and presented with some gratuities, that might show the respect the nation had for her learned husband. So the university wrote a letter to the king and council concerning Bucer's death, and their respectful interment of him, with the signification of their desire, that his majesty would send them another able professor in his room.[2] With this university-letter, Dr. Parker wrote another to Sir John Cheke, entreating him to present their letter, and that he would particularly speak to the council, and to the archbishop of Canterbury, to remember the widow. Sir John Cheke, March 9, wrote a letter in answer to Dr. Parker's;[3] which I have placed in the Appendix.[4] He therein lamented the loss of this man, commended him for his depth of knowledge, earnestness in religion, fatherliness in life, and authority in knowledge. He added, that the king would provide some grave learned man to maintain God's true learning in that university, though he thought in all points they would not meet with Bucer's like. He desired Parker, that all Bucer's books and writings might be sent up and saved for the king's majesty, except Mrs. Bucer might turn them to better account some other way.

---

[1] [C.C.C.C. MSS. No. 119, fol. 68.]

[2] [Id. No. 106, fol. 461.]

[3] [Id. No. 119, fol. 79.]

[4] No. LIX.

These books and papers were apprized at one hundred pounds. But she received but fourscore pounds of those that bought them, which she desired Parker and Haddon, the executors here in England, to testify under their hands, that she might show it to vindicate her truth and honesty, not to have wronged the heirs. The library was divided into three parts. The king had the manuscripts, which was one part; the duchess [of Somerset, I suppose] had the greater part of the books, and the archbishop of Canterbury had the remainder: for which he, for his share, paid her forty pounds. The university gave her an hundred crowns: the king an hundred marks more, besides her husband's half-year's pension, though he died before Lady-day, when it came due. He also allowed for such reasonable repairs as Bucer had bestowed about the house wherein he lived. And, March 31, 1551, she had a passage by sea granted her with eight persons in her company. She returned unto Strasburg, whither she retired, by Mr. Rich. Hills, merchant, the sum of two hundred twenty-six pounds two shillings. From Strasburg, in February the next year, she wrote a letter to the executors, wherein she acknowledged their kindness to her, praying God for them, in respect of their singular humanity and benefits which they had showed to her husband and herself, and especially when he was dead. "Miseram me," said she in that letter, "omnique solatio destitutam non deseruistis, sed in vestram me tutelam benigne suscepistis; omnia denique Christianæ charitatis officia demonstrastis."[1] Bucer left a son named Nathaniel, and a daughter named Elizabeth, behind him, at Strasburg, when he came into England, which, I suppose, were all the children he left surviving him, whom he had by a former wife that died of the plague there. By her he had many more, but they died before him.

As long as Bucer lived, there was a dear correspondence between him and P. Martyr, while they were the one at Cambridge, and the other at Oxford. In the private library at Benet College[2] there be still remaining divers letters from

---

[1] [MSS. C.C.C.C. No. 119, fol. 81.]

[2] MSS. C.C.C.C. [No. 119, fol. 105].

Martyr to him, one whereof was writ upon occasion of Bucer's communicating to him his judgment of the habits; which he had composed for the use of Hooper. Which letter began thus:—

"S. P. Perlegi, vir Dei, quæ de vestium discrimine docte pieque scripsisti, ac ex illis non mediocrem voluptatem cepi, tum quia vera quæ prædicas intelligebam, tum quod per omnia consentiebant cum his, quæ ego Londinum ad Hopperum ipsum, pridie ejus diei, qua tuæ mihi redderentur miseram." So that hence it appears they were both unanimous for wearing of the habits enjoined; and so had given their judgments to Hooper. In the same letter he answered a case put to him by Bucer,—"Quamdiu fidem in Christo generalem, confusam aut implicitam satisfuisse ad hominum salutem." And the resolution of this question being the chief matter of this letter, Archbishop Parker (into whose hands it fell) entitled it thus,—

"Quamdiu Fides implicita licuerit."

And on the margin of the same letter, where he entered upon another argument, is written by the same hand,

"De concordi confessione in re Sacramentaria."

For à Lasco had lately wrote to Martyr his desire that some confession about the sacrament might be drawn up, to which he and Bucer, and Bernardine, and Martyr, might set their hands, to testify the foreign Protestants' consent.

Another letter, wrote by Martyr to Bucer, bore this title, set to it by the same hand with the former,

"Quibus artibus instituerint disputationem theologicam in comitiis Oxoniensibus."

And on the other side of this letter,

"Gaudet disputationem non esse factam et astutia papistica in disputatione."

In a third letter he gave Bucer advice, "that he should not engage in any disputation with the vainglorious Papists."

There is yet a fourth letter, wherein Martyr communicated to him how he had been employed by the archbishop of Canterbury in taking into examination the English Book of Common Prayer, with his judgment thereon. This letter hath this title put to it by Parker,

"Censura libri communium precum."

The contents of the second and fourth letter, having some things very remarkable for the illustration of our history, I shall here set down more largely. In the former, having congratulated Bucer's coming off so well in his disputation with Young the Papist, he took notice of the unfair ways the Papists used in their disputes, and then proceeded to tell what happened to himself the last Act at Oxford this year, by a party there, that did what they could to affront him, and the evangelical truth which he taught. Certain that then went out bachelors of divinity, made this combination among themselves. One of them they set up to be respondent. The opponents, who were of the same strain, and the question to be disputed they suppressed, and kept under great silence, on purpose that Peter Martyr, the king's professor, should not know; and when some had urged to them, that it belonged to the professor to know the question, they answered that it did not, and that it was enough for them to know it that were to dispute on it. The day before the disputation was to be undertaken, about two o'clock in the afternoon, they set up the question upon the church-doors; and then it appeared to be in behalf of transubstantiation. And, to exclude the professor, they chose to themselves a great Papist, Dr. Chedsey, for their father. And here the opponents were to have taken and managed all Martyr's arguments, and the respondent was to have assoiled them as he thought good. And then the opponents were to acknowledge, they were satisfied with the answers given thereunto. And their father, who was to occupy the professor's place, was by a speech highly to approve and applaud all that had been done. And things were so to be ordered that day, that the professor should not have any opportunity of speaking. For these disputations were to have been performed but a little before night, after the civilians had finished their parts, which used to be the last exercises. Or if, after this divinity-disputation were done, the professor had been minded to say anything, he must do it when it was night, and when the tired auditors would be all going home; and then these disputants and their party were everywhere to cry, "Victory," and carry away the glory. There was now observed a greater confluence of people at this Act, than could have been believed; for they had sent about their letters to invite such hither as were for their own turn; and all to increase the triumph. Among the rest there were present the chaplains of Winchester and Durham. But all this elaborate and fine-spun plot was by a Providence broken on a sudden; the vice-chancellor, whether he feared any riot, or for what other cause, it was uncertain, forbidding the divinity-disputations that day, without the privity of the professor.

The matter of Martyr's other letter, wrote to Bucer in January (as the former was in September before), related to the Book of Common Prayer. For the correction of which the archbishop, [Goodrich] the bishop of Ely, and the other bishops were, by the king's command, met together in consultation. And that this work might be the more effectually performed, the archbishop thought good to have the judgment herein of both the public professors, Bucer and Martyr. Accordingly Bucer wrote his "Censure," and Martyr his "Annotations," as was said before;[1] a copy of which "Censure" Bucer had communicated to Martyr, who in this letter declared his consent and approbation thereunto. As to his own annotations, Cheke's Latin version, which he used, was so brief and defective, that for that reason many things were omitted by him, which he would have noted, had he seen the book complete. But after he had sent in those his annotations to the archbishop, who earnestly required them, he saw Bucer's "Censure," whereby he perceived divers other things called for correction, than he had taken notice of. So he reduced whatsoever was wanting in his annotations into certain brief articles, and acquainted the archbishop therewith; and that in them all he did freely agree with Bucer, that it were fit they should be altered. But Martyr's annotations did fully accord with Bucer's animadversions, though they were at a distance, and consulted not at all with one another before they wrote their judgments. But one thing was passed over by Bucer, which Martyr wondered at; it was in the office of the communion of the sick. Where it was ordered, "That if this private communion happened to be on the same Sunday when there should be a public one, then the priest was to take along with him some of the consecrated elements, and with them to administer the sacrament in the house of the sick. Wherein this offended Martyr, as he said, that the office that belonged to the communion should not be repeated before the sick man, and the rest that communicated with him, since the words of the supper do rather belong to the men, than to the bread and wine. And his advice was, that all that was necessarily required to the Lord's Supper should be said and done whensoever it was privately, as well as publicly, celebrated." He subscribed to Bucer's "Censure" in everything; and he thanked God, that administered an occasion, that the bishops should by them be admonished of those matters. So that it was concluded by the bishops, at their conference about the communion-book, that much should be changed therein, as the archbishop told Martyr, then at his house; and if they would not do it, the king was resolved to do it by himself and his Parliament, without them. In this letter he speaks something concerning Hooper, whose behaviour he disliked; and concerning Dr. Smith, who had lately written against the archbishop's book of the Sacrament, and against himself concerning monastic vows. Both these letters, as well worthy the sight and perusal of the reader, I have reposited in the Appendix.[1]

---

[1] Page 202.

Thus this reverend and learned foreigner, after many great difficulties passed through for the cause of religion, flying from one place to another, came at last to a natural death and a quiet end in this land. For his fame and wisdom he was called by the electors Palatine and of Brandenburg, with the emperor's permission, to temper the emperor's rescript about religion, which was to be published, that so it might please both parties. But he thought he could not do it with any honesty, and, rather than meddle with it, he fled to Strasburg with his wife and children: hereby he fell under the displeasure of those princes, as well as before he had done under that of the emperor for the Reformation of Cologne; the envy of which Melancthon escaped, but it fell on poor Bucer. Being at Strasburg, he also contracted much ill-will by means of the Anabaptists and others, whom he opposed, and who, by their pretended sanctimony, had a great party there. His friends apprehended him on these accounts in great danger; but he thought of no removal to any other place, patron, or church, trusting himself in God's hands, till Sturmius and some others advised him by all means to depart into England. Which he at length yielding to, the said Sturmius admonished him for his safer travel, to take a more uncommon way, through Lorraine and Rheims, and some other parts of France, to Calais, and there to cross over the sea. Which he did, and was very hospitably here entertained, as was said before.

---

[1] Nos. LX. LXI.

Bishops Consecrated.

June 29, John Ponet, or Poinet, D.D., chaplain to the archbishop, was consecrated bishop of Rochester, at Lambeth chapel, by the archbishop of Canterbury; assisted by Nicholas [Ridley] bishop of London, and Arthur [Bulkeley] bishop of Bangor. This consecration was performed with all the usual ceremonies and habits, probably for this reason, to give as little occasion of offence to Papists as might be, and to keep close to the old usages, avoiding superstition; therefore, it was set down in the Register at large in what formalities all was now done. The archbishop is described,[1] "Usitatis insigniis redimitus, et uno epitogio, sive capa, indutus, oratorium suum prædictum honeste et decenter ornatum ingressus," &c.—"Having on his mitre and cope, usual in such cases, went into his chapel, handsomely and decently adorned, to celebrate the Lord's Supper according to the custom, and by prescript of the book, intituled, 'The Book of Common Service.' Before the people there assembled, the holy suffrages first began, and were publicly recited, and the Espistle and Gospel read in the vulgar tongue, Nicholas [Ridley] bishop of London, and Arthur [Bulkeley] bishop of Bangor, assisting; and, having their surplices and copes on, and their pastoral staves in their hands, led Dr. John Ponet, endued with the like habits, in the middle of them, unto the most reverend father, and presented him unto him, sitting in a decent chair, and used these words: 'Most reverend father in God, we present unto you this godly and well-learned man to be consecrated bishop.' The bishop elect forthwith produced the king's letters patent before the archbishop, which, by command of the said archbishop, being read by Dr. Glyn, the said Ponet took the oath of renouncing the bishop of Rome, and then the oath of canonical obedience to the archbishop. These things being thus despatched, the archbishop exhorted the people to prayer and supplication to the Most High, according to the order prescribed in the Book of Ordination, set forth in the month of March, 1549. According to which order he was elected and consecrated, and endued with the episcopal ornaments, the bishop of London first having read the third chapter of the first Epistle of Paul to Timothy, in manner of a sermon. These things being done, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper celebrated upon a table, covered with a white linen cloth, by the archbishop and two assisting bishops, the same archbishop decreed to write to the archdeacon of Canterbury for the investiture, installation, and enthronization of the said bishop of Rochester, as it was customary. Present, Anthony Huse, principal register of the archbishop; Peter Lilly, John Lewis, John Incent, public notaries; and many others, as well clerks as laics."

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [fol. 330, 331].

March 8, John Hooper was consecrated bishop of Gloucester, just after the same manner, by the archbishop; Nicholas [Ridley] bishop of London, and John [Poinet] bishop of Rochester, assisting, clothed (say the words of the Register), in linen surplices and copes, and John, elect of Gloucester, in the like habit.

CHAPTER XXV.

The Archbishop publisheth his Book against Gardiner.[1]

THIS year our archbishop published his elaborate book of the Sacrament, confuting the gross and carnal presence of

---

[1] [The reader, who may be curious to learn the cause of discussion between Cranmer and Gardiner, and the arguments of each, will find their respective "books" in the first volume of the Parker Society's edition of the Works of Abp. Cranmer.]

Christ there, in vindication of a former book of his, wrote against by Bishop Gardiner and Dr. Smith. For, to give the reader some distinct account of this matter, in the year 1550, Cranmer printed a book in English in quarto with this title: "A Defence of the true and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ; with a Confutation of sundry Errors concerning the same: grounded and established upon God's Holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church." The great reason that moved him to write this book was, that he might the more effectually purge the Church of Popery; esteeming transubstantiation, and the mass, to be the very roots of it. "The taking away of beads, pilgrimages, pardons, and such-like Popery, was (as he wrote in his Preface), but the lopping off a few branches, which would soon spring up again, unless the roots of the tree, which were transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, were pulled up. Therefore, out of a sincere zeal to the honour of God, he would labour," he said, "in His vineyard to cut down that tree of error, root and branch." By this book very many were enlightened to perceive the errors of the Popish doctrines of the sacrament. This treatise he divided into five books or points. I. Of the true and catholic doctrine and use of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. II. Against the error of transubstantiation. III. The manner how Christ is present in the sacrament. IV. Of the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ. V. Of the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ. In the third part he made mention of the bishop of Winchester, in these words: "As many of them [*i. e.* of the Papist writers] as I have read, (the bishop of Winchester only excepted), do say, that Christ called not the bread His body." This bishop was much offended that he was named in the book, and pretended this to be one reason why he did write against it, to vindicate himself, as well as the Papal Church, hereby so dangerously struck at. This book of Cranmer's was turned into Latin by John Young, who complied afterwards with the old religion under Queen Mary, and was master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

At this book the defenders of Popery were so nettled, that, in the same year, 1550, Winchester then in the Tower, and fickle Dr. Smith then at Louvain, printed answers. Of Smith's book I shall only note by the way, that, March 8, 1550, there was an order of council to examine the bringer over of his book against Cranmer: such a countenance did the state give to the archbishop and his book. Gardiner's book made the greatest noise, which was printed in France, and intituled, "An Explication and Assertion of the true Catholic Faith touching the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar, with the Confutation of a Book written against the same." In the beginning of his book he wrote, "that his sermon before the king [on St. Peter's day],[1] touching the sacrament of the altar, gave occasion to the archbishop's book against it; and that he was called before the king's commissioners at Lambeth for his Catholic faith in the sacrament." Whereas indeed this was not the cause of his troubles; nor had some former copies of his book these words; but, after the commission was issued forth against him, to make his cause appear the more specious, as if it were the cause of the Church, he thought fit to make an alteration in the beginning of his book in the manner above said, and, to carry on the scene, he in open court offered his book before the king's commissioners.

To this book of Gardiner's our archbishop studied and composed an answer; holding himself bound, for the vindication of the evangelical truth, as well as of his own writing, and for the satisfaction of the people, not to suffer it to lie untaken notice of. When it was known the archbishop was preparing an answer against Gardiner, the people were in very great expectation, and conceived an earnest desire to see and read it; having therefore despatched his copy, and sent it to Rainold Wolf, his printer, it was printed off in the month of September, 1551. But there was some stop put to the publishing of it, occasioned by a proclamation issued out from the king, whereby, for some political ends, both the printing and selling of English books, without the allowance of the king's majesty, or six of his privy-council, were forbidden. The archbishop, being desirous that his book might come abroad the next term, for the contentation of many who had long expected the same, sent to Secretary

---

[1] [See above, p. 324.]

Cecil and Sir John Cheke to procure, either from the king or council, a license to the said Wolf for printing and selling his book, which was obtained, and the book published accordingly. This letter of the archbishop's, dated Sept. 29, I have thought not amiss to reposit in the Appendix.[1] October 1, a license was granted to Wolf to publish the book, under the king's privilege, the court then being at Hampton-court, and the archbishop himself present. The title this second book of the archbishop's bore was, "An Answer by the Reverend Father in God Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, unto a crafty and sophistical Cavillation, devised by Stephen Gardiner, Doctor of Law, late Bishop of Winchester, against the true and godly Doctrine of the most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ. Wherein is also, as occasion serveth, answered such places of the Book of Dr. Richard Smith, as may seem anything worthy the answering. Also a true copy of the Book written, and in open Court delivered, by Dr. Stephen Gardiner, not one word added or diminished, but faithfully in all points agreeing with the original." This book of Archbishop Cranmer's was printed again at London, 1580, with his life, and some other things.

His reply to Gardiner was in the most fair and candid method that could be devised: for he first set down his own treatise, piece by piece; then Gardiner's reply thereunto, word for word, leaving not one paragraph without a full answer. His reply to Smith was only of some things most worthy to be taken notice of, the rest of Smith's book being mere trifles. This reply to Smith he inserted in the body of his answer to Gardiner, as occasion served: only at the end he made a particular reply to Smith's preface.

It seemed to be a very complete exercitation upon that subject. The book was stored with so great learning and plenty of arguments, "Ut ea controversia," saith one of his successors, "a nemine unquam contra Pontificios accuratius tractata esse videatur;"—"That no one controversy was by any ever handled against the Papists more accurately."[2] It may not be amiss to mention here the opinion that Cranmer himself had of his book, in that famous and renowned confession he made of his faith in St. Mary's church, Oxon, immediately before he was led away to his burning. Where he expressed his full approbation and great confidence of the doctrine contained therein, saying, "that as for the sacrament, he believed as he had taught in his book against the bishop of Winchester. The which book," he said, "taught so true a doctrine of the sacrament, that it should stand at the last day before the judgment of God, where the Papistical doctrine, contrary thereto, should be ashamed to show her face."[1] The Papists spake as much against this book, being much galled by it. Dr. Tresham, in his disputation with Latimer, said, there were six hundred errors in the book. Weston, thinking to invalidate the book by the pretended novelty of the doctrine, asked the same father, how long he had been of that opinion? He said, not past seven years; that is, about the year 1547; and that Archbishop Cranmer's book confirmed his judgment therein: and added, that if he could but remember all therein contained, he would not fear to answer any man in this matter.[2]

---

[1] No. LXII.

[2] [Parker,] in Antiq. Brit. [p. 400].

The archbishop had acknowledged to the queen's commissioners at Oxford, that Ridley had first begun to enlighten him as to the true notion of the presence, as he had maintained it in his book. Hereupon one of them took occasion to try to baffle the true doctrine, by making the whole stress of it to depend upon the authority of single Ridley.[3] Latimer, said he, leaned upon Cranmer, and Cranmer leaned upon Ridley.[4] Whereas the truth of this was no more, but that Ridley, reading Bertram's book of the body and blood of Christ, was sharpened to examine the old opinion more accurately, of the presence of Christ's flesh and blood; and looking into ecclesiastical authors, he found it greatly controverted in the ninth century, and learnedly writ against, which made him begin to conclude it none of the ancient doctrines of the Church, but more lately brought into it. These his thoughts he communicated to Archbishop Cranmer, which was about the year 1546, whereupon they both set to examine it with more than ordinary care, and all the arguments that Cranmer gathered about it he digested into his book.[1] Nor was the good archbishop ashamed to make a public acknowledgment in print of this, as well as of his other Popish errors, in his answer to Smith's preface, who, it seems, had charged him with inconstancy. "This I confess of myself, that, not long before I wrote the said catechism, I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past in many other errors; as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass, of pilgrimages, of purgatory, &c., being brought up from my youth in them.—For the which, and other the offences of my youth, I do daily pray unto God for mercy and pardon.—But after it pleased God to show me, by His holy word, a more perfect knowledge of His Son Jesus Christ—I put away my former ignorance. And as God gave me light, so through His grace I opened my eyes to receive it.—And I trust in God's mercy for pardon of my former errors."[2] I set this down the more at large, to show the great ingenuity as well as piety of this good man.

---

[1] Fox's Acts and Monuments, [vol. viii. p. 88].

[2] [Id. vol. vi. p. 505.]

[3] [Id. vol. vi. p. 57.]

[4] [Id. vol. vii. p. 538.]

Peter Martyr, in the year following this, printed a book of the sacrament, which was the sum of what he had read before upon that point in the university of Oxford.[3] Which book he dedicated to his patron, the archbishop of Canterbury; and, giving the reason why he made the dedication to him, said, "That he knew certainly that Cranmer had so great skill in this controversy, as one could hardly find in any one besides. That there was none of the fathers which he had not diligently noted; no ancient or modern book extant that he [Martyr] had not with his own eyes seen noted by the archbishop's hand. Whatsoever belonged to the whole controversy, he said that the archbishop had digested into particular chapters; councils, canons, popes' decrees, pertaining hereunto; and that with so great labour that, unless he had been an eyewitness of it and seen it, he could not easily have believed others, if they had told him, in regard of the infinite toil, diligence, and exactness wherewith the archbishop had done it." He added, "that the archbishop had not bestowed such kind of pains and study in the matter of the sacrament only, but that he had done the same thing as to all other doctrines, in effect, which in that age were especially under controversy. And this, that learned man said, he had made good observation of. Nor," as he went on, "that he wanted skill, a method, and industry in defending what he held. Which might," he said, "be known by this, because he had so often conflicted with his adversaries, both publicly and privately, and by a marvellous strength of learning, quickness of wit, and dexterity of management, had asserted what he held to be true, from the thorny and intricate cavils of sophisters [glancing at his controversies with Winchester, who was commonly then called the sophister]; and that he wanted not a will, yea, a mind ready to defend sound and Christian doctrines. That all men did sufficiently understand, who saw him burn with so great an endeavour of restoring religion, that for this cause only he had great and heavy enemies, and neglected many commodities of this life, and underwent horrible dangers." The great and intimate converse that P. Martyr had with Cranmer, gave him opportunity to know him very well; and therefore I have chosen to set down this character that he gave of him, and particularly of his ability in this controversy of the Eucharist.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vii. p. 409.]

[2] [Cranmer's "Answer to Smith's Preface," Parker Society's edition, vol. i. p. 374.]

[3] [*I. e.* Tractat. de Sacramento, Lond. 1549. From which Strype translated the following passages, and of which the original is given in the Eccl. History Society's edition, vol. ii. pp. 323, 324.]

And I am apt to think that the careful perusal of these authorities, collected by the archbishop, and his conversation with this learned prelate, being much with him at Lambeth, was a cause of bringing Martyr to the true doctrine; for, at his first coming to Oxon, he was a Papist, or a Lutheran, as to the belief of the presence. And so Feckenham, dean of St. Paul's, told Bartlet Green at his examination; and that Martyr, perceiving the king's council, as he uncharitably suggested, to be of another opinion, he, to please them, forsook the true Catholic faith. But Mr. Green, who had been a hearer of him at Oxon, replied, that he had heard Martyr say, "That he had not, while he was a Papist, read St. Chrysostom upon the tenth to the Corinthians, nor many other places of the doctors; but when he had read them, and well considered them, he was content to yield to them, having first humbled himself in prayer, desiring God to illuminate him, and bring him to the true understanding of Scripture."[1]

As to the authorities the archbishop allegeth in his book, it was the conjecture of John Fox, that he made use of Frith's book, which he wrote of the sacrament against More, divers years before; and that from the said author the archbishop seemed to have collected the testimonies of the doctors, which he produced in his apology against the bishop of Winchester; and that he gathered the principal and chiefest helps thence, that he leaned to.[2] But although he might peruse Frith, as he did almost all other authors that wrote of this controversy, yet he was too well versed in the ecclesiastical writers, that he needed to go a borrowing to the readings of any others, for sentences and allegations out of them.

Cranmer lived to see his book replied again unto by his adversary Gardiner, in Latin, under the feigned name of Marcus Antonius Constantius, a divine of Louvain. His book went under this title, "Confutatio cavillationum, quibus Sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ab impiis Capernaitis impeti solet." Printed at Paris 1552.[3] In this book he spared the name of the archbishop, but reduceth all the archbishop's book into no less than two hundred and fifty objections; to each of which, one by one, the Catholic is brought in making answer. Next, whereas Cranmer had laid down twelve rules for the finding out the true sense of the fathers in their writings, the Catholic examines them, and enervates them. Then follows a confutation of the solutions, whereby the secretary, as he is called (that is, Cranmer), endeavoured to take off the arguments of the Catholics. And, which is the fourth and last part of the book, he defends Catholic men's sense of the allegations out of the fathers against the sectaries. Gardiner, when he compiled this book, was in the Tower a prisoner; but yet he was under so easy restraint, that he was furnished there with workmen and amanuenses. "As they of old to the building of the tabernacle, so he to the preparing of his book, a kind of Papistical tabernacle [to use the words of Martyr], all sorts contributed something. For his book was Pandora's box, to which all the lesser gods brought their presents. For every man, were his learning less or more, that had any arguments for the Popish doctrine, brought them all to him (many whereof were windy and trivial enough), and he out of the heap made his collections as he thought good." But Watson and Smith were his chief assistants.

---

[1] Fox's Acts [and Monuments, vol. vii. pp. 739, 740].

[2] [Id. vol. vi. p. 9.]

[3] ["This book was not published at Paris, but at Louvain; there were two editions also of it, the first issued A.D. 1552, and the second 1554. See Watt's Bibliothec. Brit. (Authors), vol. i. col. 400, ed. Edinb. 1822."—Note at p. 326 of vol. ii. of the Eccl. History Society's edition.]

The archbishop, though the times now soon after turned, and he cast into prison, was very desirous to prepare another book in confutation of Marcus Antonius, and in vindication of his own writing. He lived long enough to finish three parts, whereof two unhappily perished in Oxford, and the third fell into John Fox's hands, and for aught I know, that by this time is perished also.[1] But the great desire he had to finish his answer to that book was the chief cause that, at his last appearance before the queen's commissioners, he made his appeal to a general council; that thereby he might gain some time and leisure to accomplish what he had begun, before his life were taken away, which he saw was likely to be within a very short space. "Otherwise [as he writ to his lawyer, who was to draw up his appeal], it was much better for him to die in Christ's quarrel, and to reign with Him, than to be shut up and kept in that body; unless it were to continue yet still awhile in this warfare, for the commodity and profit of his brethren, and to the further advancing of God's glory."[2]

Peter Martyr, his surviving and learned friend, being solicited by many Englishmen by letter and word of mouth, undertook the answering this book. But before he had finished it, an English divine and friend of Martyr's, with whom he held correspondence in Queen Mary's reign, wrote him word, in the year 1557, that an answer to Antonius, by some other hand, was then in the press, naming the author. Martyr replied, "That he was rather glad of it, than anyways moved or disturbed at it, as a disappointment of what he was doing; and added, that he expected nothing from that man but what was very exquisite, acute, and elaborate; but that he feared the noise thereof would not hold true."[1] And so it proved. Whether this learned man withdrew his book, that he might give way to that which P. Martyr was writing, or whether it were a flam given out to stop Martyr in his design, it is uncertain. But not long after this learned Italian put forth his answer. He had it under the press at Zurich in December 1558; and it came out the next year.[2] Wherein, as he wrote to Calvin, he did unravel and confute all the sophisms and tricks of [Gardiner] the bishop of Winchester. And it came forth very seasonably, as Martyr hoped. For hereby the English Papalins might see, at this time especially, that that book was not, as they boasted hitherto, invincible. He gave this title to his book, "Defensio Doctrinæ veteris et Apostolicæ de SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento." In the preface to which he showed how this work fell to his lot; not that that most reverend father wanted an assistant, for he could easily have managed Gardiner himself. For he knew how Cranmer, in many and various disputes formerly had with him, came off with victory and great praise; but because the archbishop, when in prison, was forced to leave his answer, which he had begun, unfinished, by reason of his strait keeping, having scarce paper and ink allowed him, and no books to make use of; and being cut off so soon by death, before he could bring to perfection what he had writ. Wherein, as Martyr said, he had harder measure by far from the Papists, than Gardiner had from the Protestants in King Edward's days, when he wrote his book.

---

[1] [See Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. p. 35.]

[2] [This letter is printed in the Parker Society's edition of Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 455.]

Gardiner, in that book of his under the name of M. Constantius, had shown such foul play with Cranmer's book, mangling it, and taking pieces and scraps of it here and there, and confounding the method of it, to supply himself with objections to give his own answers to with the most advantage, that the archbishop thought, that if learned foreigners saw but his first book of the Sacrament, as he wrote it, it would be vindication enough against Gardiner's new book against it; and therefore he took order to have it translated into the same language in which Gardiner wrote, that is, Latin, that impartial strangers might be able to read and judge; and Sir John Cheke elegantly performed it for his friend the archbishop. This book of Cranmer's, thus put into Latin, with some additions, came forth 1553. Before it he prefixed an epistle to King Edward VI., dated at Lambeth, idib. Mart. the same year, wherein he said, "It was his care of the Lord's flock committed to him, that put him upon renewing and restoring the Lord's supper according to the institution of Christ. And that that was the reason that, about three years ago, he set forth a book in English against the principal abuses of the Papistical mass." Which book had great success upon the people's minds, in bringing them to embrace the truth. "Whereby," he said, "he perceived how great the force of truth was, and understood the benefits of the grace of Christ, that even the blind should have their eyes opened, and partake of the light of truth, as soon as it was revealed, and showed itself clearly to them. But that this gave great offence unto Gardiner, then bishop of Winchester, so that he thought nothing was to be done till he had answered the book, supposing that there would be no helper of so declining and forsaken a cause, unless he put to his hand." And so the archbishop proceeded to show how that bishop first put forth his English book, endeavouring to overthrow the true doctrine, and to restore and bring again into repute the mass, with all its superstitions; and afterwards his Latin book, under a feigned name.[1] In which Gardiner had so unfairly dealt with the archbishop's arguments, chopping and changing, defacing and disfiguring them, that he could not know them for his own; and all that he might make it serve his own turn the better; insomuch that he resolved to have his own book translated out of English into Latin, that his true opinion and mind in this controversy might the better be apprehended. The whole epistle is writ in a pure elegant Latin style, with a good sharpness of wit.

---

[1] Mart. Epist. [ad calc. loc. Commun. p. 1118].

[2] P. Martyr. Ep. [This letter may be seen in Calvin. Epist. et Respons. p. 133.]

---

[1] "Constantius enim libro Latine scripto, ita argumenta mea persequitur, ut sibi optimum videtur; et ut causam juvet, sæpe truncata, sæpe inversa, sæpe disjecta, sic introducit, ut non magisa me agnosci potuerint, quam Medeæ liberi in multa membra dissecti et deformati," &c. [Defens. vera et Cathol. doctr. de Sacrament. Epist. ad Regem, vol. i. p. 10. Parker Society's edition of Cranmer's Works.]

The publication of this his Latin book he thought sufficient for the present to entertain the world, till he should put forth, in Latin also, a full answer to Gardiner, which he intended shortly to do. To this Latin book the archbishop, occasionally reviewing it while he was in prison, made sundry annotations and additions; not of any new arguments, but only of more authorities out of the fathers and ancient writers. This valuable autograph fell into the hands of some of the English exiles at Embden, it may be by the means of Bishop Scory, who was superintendent of the English church there, or Sir John Cheke, who also for some time was in this place; both great friends of the archbishop. In the year 1557 the exiles here printed it with this title, "Defensio, &c. a Thoma Cranmero Martyre scripta. Ab authore in vinculis recognita et aucta." Before it is a new preface to the reader, made, as it is thought, by Sir John Cheke, relating to the archbishop and this his book, showing how well weighed and well thought on this doctrine of the Sacrament was, before he published it, and that he let it not go abroad till he had diligently compared and pondered all Scriptures and ancient authors, and confirmed it at last by his blood. In the body of the book, the places where any enlargements are, are signified by an hand pointing thereunto. In the margin is often to be found this word "Object." with certain numbers added; which numbers show those places which Gardiner, under the name of Marcus Antonius, did endeavour to confute. The very original these English exiles here at Embden kept, as a great treasure, among them, and as a memorial of the holy martyr.[1]

Besides this, the archbishop fully intended to have his vindication of his book, impugned by Gardiner, put into Latin also; but he lived not to see that done. But care was taken of this business among the exiles; insomuch that both Sir John Cheke and John Fox were busied about it at the same time. But the former surceased, and left the whole work to Fox, then at Frankfort, after he had finished the first part. In this piece done by Cheke, John à Lasco had an hand; for he put in the Latin school-terms, instead of more pure good Latin, which Cheke had used. And it was judged fit that such words should be used, where the archbishop in his English had used them. And this Cheke and à Lasco themselves wrote to Fox. Fox undertook the rest, by the incitation and encouragement of P. Martyr, and of Grindal and Pilkington, both bishops afterwards, who gave him directions for the translating; and as doubts occurred concerning the sense of certain matters in the book, as he met with them, he consulted with these men for their judgments therein. Grindal, in one letter, bade him write a catalogue of all passages by him doubted of, and send it to him. Fox finished his translation in the year 1557, before June; for which he had a congratulatory letter from Grindal, who was his chief assistant and counsellor herein. The work was despatched to the press, at Basle, I suppose; and, when one part was printed, the censors of the press thought it would be better to defer an argument of that nature to better times, the controversy having been bandied up and down so much already; but Froscover undertook the printing of the whole book. Fox would do nothing of himself; but, leaving himself to the judgment of his learned brethren, to commit the work now to Froscover, or no, Queen Mary's death, and the return of the exiles, I suppose, stopped further progress in this matter. The original manuscript, under Fox's own hand, in very cleanly elegant Latin, I have lying by me; it bears this title:—"De tota Sacramenti Eucharistiæ causa Institutionum Libri V. Autore D. THOMA CRANMERO Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi. Quibus et Stephani Garneri Episcopi Wintoniensi, et SMYTHI Doctoris Theologi, impugnationibus respondetur."[1]

---

[1] "Autographon ejus in nostra apud Æmbdanos ecclesia pro thesauro quodam, et clarissimi viri, sanctique Christi martyris mnemosyno servamus." In Epist. [pio lectori, Defens. veræ et Cathol. doct. de Sacrament. vol. i. p. 7, as above].

And that I may bring here together all that relates to Cranmer, as to this matter of the sacrament, I must not omit what I saw in the Benet library. There is a thin note-book of this archbishop's, with this title, wrote by his own hand, "De re Sacramentaria," which I verily believe are his meditations and conclusions, when he set himself accurately to examine the sacramental controversy, and fell off from the opinion of the carnal presence. The notes consist of nothing but quotations out of ancient ecclesiastical authors about the Lord's Supper, interlined in many places by the archbishop's pen. On the top of some of the pages are these sentences writ by himself, being doctrines proveable out of the sentences there produced and transcribed:[1]—

---

[1] Fox Epp. MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxviii.]

"Panis vocatur corpus Christi, et vinum sanguis.

"Panis est corpus meum, et vinum est sanguis meus; figurativæ sunt locutiones.

"Quid significet hæc figura, edere carnem, et bibere sanguinem.

"Mali non edunt et bibunt corpus et sanguinem Domini.

"Patres Veteris Testamenti edebant et bibebant Christum, sicut et nos.

"Sicut in Eucharistia, ita in Baptismo, præsens est Christus.

"Contra Transubstantiationem."

After this, follow those writings of the archbishop's own hand (which Archbishop Parker elsewhere transcribed for his own satisfaction):—

"Multa affirmant crassi Papistæ, seu Capernaitæ, quæ neque Scriptura neque ullus veterum unquam dixerat, viz.:—

"Quod accidentia maneant sine subjecto.

"Quod accidentia panis et vini sunt Sacramenta: non panis et vinum.

"Quod panis non est figura, sed accidentia panis.

"Quod Christus non appellavit panem corpus suum.

"Quod cum Christus dixit, Hoc est corpus meum, pronomen Hoc non refertur ad panem, sed ad corpus Christi.

"Quod tot corpora Christi accipimus, aut toties corpus ejus accipimus, quoties, aut in quot partes, dentibus secamus panem."

Thus having set down divers assertions of Papists, or "Capernaites," as he styled them, which neither Scripture nor ancient fathers knew anything of, his notes proceed to state wherein Papists and Protestants disagree:—

---

[1] Miscellan. A. [C.C.C.C. MSS. No. 102, fol. 151].

"Præcipua capita in quibus a Papisticis dissentimus.

"Christum Papistæ statuunt in pane, nos in homine comedente.

"Illi in comedentis ore, nos in toto homine.

"Illi corpus Christi aiunt evolare, masticato vel consumpto pane; nos manere in homine dicimus, quamdiu membrum est Christi.

"Illi in pane statuunt per annum integrum, et diutius, si duret panis: nos in homine statuimus inhabitare, quamdiu templum Dei fuerit.

"Illorum sententia, quod ad realem præsentiam attinet, non amplius edit homo quam bellua, neque magis ei prodest, quam cuivis animanti."

Thus God made use of this archbishop, who was once one of the most violent asserters of the corporeal presence, to be the chiefest instrument of overthrowing it. But this good work required to be carried on after Cranmer's death; for great brags were made of Gardiner's second book; and it was boasted, that none dared to encounter this their Goliath. P. Martyr was thought the fittest man to succeed Cranmer in this province, to maintain the truth that began now to shine forth. He, overcome by the solicitation of friends, composed a book against Gardiner, as was said before,[1] and printed it at Zurich. Wherein, 1. He defended the arguments of our men, which had been collected together, and pretended to be confuted by Gardiner's book. 2. He defended those rules, which Cranmer had put forth in his tract of the sacrament. 3. He maintained those answers, whereby the arguments of the adversaries were wont to be refuted. And, 4. He asserted the just and true interpretation of certain places out of the fathers, which Gardiner and his companions brought for themselves and their errors.

After this defence followed another by the same author, printed in the same town of Zurich, against two books of Dr. Richard Smith, concerning the single life of priests, and monastic vows, which he wrote at Louvain against Martyr. For when Martyr had read at Oxford upon 1 Corinthians, chap. vii. where the apostle speaks much of virginity and matrimony (the notes of which readings Smith had very diligently taken, being constantly present at them); from thence he composed two books, not so strong as malicious, "Of the Celibacy of Priests," and "Of Vows," designing thereby to confute Martyr's arguments, which he therefore thought fit to vindicate. In this book he not only answered Smith's arguments, but whatever else he could meet with upon that subject. But it was thought to be a very improper undertaking, and proved cause of mirth, that so filthy a fellow as Smith was known to be, and once taken in the act of adultery, should write a book of priestly chastity. Which occasioned these verses made by Laurence Humphrey:—

---

[1] [See above, p. 375.]

> "Haud satis affabre tractans fabrilia Smithus,
> Librum de vita cælibe composuit, &c.
> Dumque pudicitiam, dum vota monastica laudat,
> Stuprat, sacra notans fœdera conjugii."

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Duke of Somerset's Death. New Bishops.

THE archbishop of Canterbury this year lost the duke of Somerset, whom he much valued, and who had been a great assistant to him in the Reformation of the Church, and a true friend to it. His violent death exceedingly grieved the good archbishop, both because he knew it would prove a great let to religion, and was brought about by evil men, to the shedding of innocent blood, for the furthering the ends of ambition, and begat in him fears and jealousies of the king's life. It is very remarkable what I meet with in one of my manuscripts[1] There was a woman, somewhat before the last apprehension of the duke, wife of one

---

[1] Inter Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxxv. 127].

Woocock, of Poole, in Dorsetshire, that gave out, that there was a voice that followed her, which sounded these words always in her ears: "He whom the king did best trust should deceive him, and work treason against him." After she had a good while reported this, Sir William Barkley, who married the Lord Treasurer Winchester's daughter, sent her up to London to the council, with two of his servants. She was not long there, but, without acquainting the duke of Somerset, whom it seemed most to concern (he being the person whom the king most trusted), was sent home again with her purse full of money. And, after her coming home, she was more busy in that talk than before. So that she came to a market-town called Wimborne, four miles from Poole, where she reported, that the voice continued following her as before. This looked, by the circumstances, like a practice of some Popish priests, accustomed to dealing in such frauds, to make the world the more inclinable to believe the guilt of the good duke, which Somerset's enemies were now framing against him. And so some of the wiser sort thereabouts did seem to think; for there were two merchants of Poole that heard her, and took a note of her words, and came to the house of Hancock, minister of Poole, who was known to the duke, counselling him to certify my lord of her. Which Hancock accordingly did, and came to Sion, where the duke then was, and told him of the words. He added, "Whom the king doth best trust we do not know; but that all the king's loving subjects did think that his grace was most worthy to be best trusted, and that his grace had been in trouble, and that all the king's loving subjects did pray for his grace to the Almighty to preserve him, that he might never come in the like trouble again."

Then the duke asked him whether he had a note of the words; which, when he had received from Hancock, he said to him, suspecting the plot, "Ah! sirrah, this is strange, that these things should come before the counsellors, and I not hear of it. I am of the council also." He asked Hancock, before whom of the council this matter was brought? who replied, he knew not certain, but as he supposed. The duke asked him, whom he supposed? He answered, Before the lord treasurer, because his son-in-law, Sir W. Barkley, sent her up. The duke subjoined, It was like to be so.

This was three weeks before his last apprehension. This I extract out of Mr. Hancock's own narration of himself and his troubles; to which he added, that, at his first apprehension, the report was, that the duke, what time as he was fetched out of Windsor Castle, having the king by the hand, should say, "It is not I that they shoot at; this is the mark that they shoot at;" meaning the king. Which by the sequel proved too true. For that good, godly, and virtuous prince lived not long after the death of that good duke.

Indeed it seemed to have been a plot of the Papists, and the bishop of Winchester at the bottom of it. This is certain, when, in October 1549, the duke was brought to the Tower, the bishop was then borne in hand he should be set at liberty, of which he had such confidence, that he prepared himself new apparel against the time he should come out; thinking verily to have come abroad within eight or ten days. But finding himself disappointed, he wrote an expostulatory letter to the lords within a month after, to put them in remembrance, as Stow writes.[1]

The articles that were drawn up against the duke, upon his second apprehension and trial, were in number twenty, which I shall not repeat here, as I might out of a manuscript thereof, because they may be seen in Fox.[2] But I do observe one of the articles is not printed in his book, namely, the tenth, which ran thus: "Also, you are charged, that you have divers and many times, both openly and privately, said and affirmed, that the nobles and gentlemen were the only causes of the dearth of things, whereby the people rose, and did reform things themselves." Whence it appears, that one cause of the hatred of the nobility and gentry against him was, because he spake against their debauches and excesses, covetousness and oppressions. But that which I chiefly observe here is, that the draught of these articles, which I have seen, were made by Bishop Gardiner, being his very hand, unless I am much mistaken. So that he, I suppose, was privately dealt with and consulted (being then a prisoner in the Tower), to be a party in assisting and carrying on this direful plot against the duke, to take away his life, notwithstanding his outward friendship and fair correspondence in letters with the said duke. But Gardiner was looked upon to be a good manager of accusations; and he was ready enough to be employed here, that he might put to his hand in taking off one that was such a great instrument of promoting the Reformation.

---

[1] [Stow's Chronicle, p. 600.]

[2] [Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 290.]

He is generally charged for the great spoil of churches and chapels, defacing ancient tombs and monuments, and pulling down the bells in parish churches, and ordering only one bell in a steeple, as sufficient to call the people together. Which set the commonalty almost into a rebellion.

As the archbishop the last year had procured amendments and alterations in the book of public prayers, and had consulted therein with the two learned foreign divines, Bucer and Martyr:[1] so this year, in January, an act was made by the Parliament for authorizing the new book, and obliging the subjects to be present at the reading of it. In this book the general confession was added, and the absolution. At the beginning of the second service was added the recital of the Ten Commandments, with the short ejaculation to be said between each commandment. Something was left out in the consecration of the sacrament, that seemed to favour a corporal presence. Several rites were laid aside, as that of oil in confirmation, and extreme unction, and prayer for the dead, which was before used in the communion-office, and that of burial, together with the change and abolishing of some other things that were offensive or superstitious: as may be seen by those that will take the pains to compare the two books, the one printed in the year 1549, and the other 1552. And this was brought about by the great and long diligence and care of our pious archbishop, and no question to his great joy and satisfaction, so that I look upon that but as an improbable report, that was carried about in Frankfort in those unseemly branglings among the English exiles there, that Bullinger should say, "That Cranmer had drawn up a book of prayers an hundred times more perfect than that which was then in being; but the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and convocation, with other enemies." But as his authority was now very great, so there was undoubtedly a great deference paid to it, as also to his wisdom and learning, by the rest of the divines appointed to that work; so that as nothing was by them inserted into the Liturgy but by his good allowance and approbation, so neither would they reject or oppose what he thought fit should be put in or altered.

---

[1] [See above, p. 363.]

The learning, piety, and good deserts of Miles Coverdale, in translating the holy Scriptures into the English tongue, and in a constant preaching of the Gospel, and sticking to the true profession for many a year; and withal, very probably, their ancient acquaintance in Cambridge, were reasons that made our archbishop a particular friend to him. When the Lord Russel was sent down against the rebels in the west, he was attended by Coverdale to preach among them. Coverdale afterwards became coadjutor to Voisey, the bishop of Exeter, who seldom resided, and took little care of his diocese. But this year, whether voluntary or by some order, he resigned up his bishopric, having first greatly spoiled it of its revenues. And when some wise and bold person, and excellent preacher, was found extremely needful to be sent thither to inspect the clergy and ecclesiastic matters in those parts, the late rebellion having been raised chiefly by priests in hatred to the religion, heating and disaffecting the minds of the common people, Coverdale was judged a very fit person to succeed in that charge. Being now bishop elect of Exon, he had long attended at court to get his matters despatched; namely, the doing of his homage, and the obtaining a suit to be excused the payment of his first-fruits, being but a poor man. But such at that time were the great and urgent affairs of the state, or the secret hinderers of the Gospel, that he found nothing but delays. So that he was forced to apply himself unto his friend the archbishop, to forward his business; who forthwith sent his letters to Secretary Cecil, making Coverdale himself the bearer, entreating him to use his interest to get this bishop despatched, and that with speed; urging this for his reason (becoming his paternal care over his province), that so he might, without further delay, go down into the western parts, which had great need of him. And also because he was minded, on the 30th of August, to consecrate him and the bishop of Rochester [Scory], according to the king's mandate.

This Scory was at first preferred by the archbishop to be one of the six preachers at Canterbury, and always continued firm to the purity of religion, and endured double for the good and wholesome doctrine that he preached, having been presented and complained of, both in the spiritual courts, and to the justices at their sessions, when the Six Articles were in force. He was a married man, and so deprived at the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, fled beyond sea, and was superintendent of the English congregation at Embden in Friesland. There, in the year 1555, he wrote and printed "A comfortable Epistle unto all the Faithful that be in prison, or in any other trouble for the defence of God's Truth. Wherein he doth as well by the promises of Mercy, as also by the examples of divers holy Martyrs, comfort, encourage, and strengthen them patiently, for Christ's sake, to suffer the manifold cruel and most tyrannous persecutions of Antichristian tormentors." As the book bears title.

There were divers bishoprics vacant this year, as that of Lincoln by the death of Holbeach. The archbishop deputed the spiritualties to John Pope, LL.B. and chancellor of that church. The Church commending unto the archbishop this Pope, and two more; viz. John Prinne, LL.D. subdean of the church, and Christopher Massingberde, LL.B. archdeacon of Stow.[1] So he chose the first; but yet he committed a special trust to Taylor, the dean of Lincoln (whom he knew to be tight to religion), sending a commission fiduciary to him, before Pope entered upon his office, to give the said Pope his oath, "legally and faithfully to perform his office committed to him by the archbishop, and to answer to the said archbishop for all obventions coming to him by virtue of his jurisdiction and office; and that he should not, by malice or wrong, squeeze the subjects of the king, and of that diocese, whether clerks or laicks; that he should not knowingly grieve them in their estates or persons; and that he shall abstain from oppressions, extortions, and unlawful exactions; and that he shall renounce the bishop of Rome's usurped jurisdiction and authority, according to the statutes of Parliament." And of all this he wrote a letter to the said Pope, signifying that he required such an oath of him to be taken before the dean. The tenor of the archbishop's letter to the dean went on further, "requiring him by his sound counsel, singular prudence, and by the assistance of his sincere judgment, to be present with him in any hard cases, and of great moment; and that he would not be wanting to him in any matters of that sort, being a person of that knowledge in sacred and profane learning, of that prudence, circumspection, and dexterity in managing business. And so finally joined him with Pope to perform all this piously and catholicly, according to the rule of evangelic religion, and the exigency of the laws and statutes of this kingdom." And deputed him his vicegerent. This letter was dated at Croydon, the 20th of August. This commission seemed to be somewhat extraordinary; the occasion whereof might be, because the archbishop did not confide in this chancellor of the church, suspecting his religion, and compliance with the king's proceedings, therefore he thought good to associate him with Taylor, the dean, of whom he was well assured.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [121, 122].

The church of Worcester became also vacant by the deprivation of Heath, the bishop. The archbishop committed the spiritualties thereof to John Barlow, dean of the said church, and Roland Taylor, LL.D. his domestic chaplain.[1] These he constituted his officials to exercise all episcopal jurisdiction. This commission was dated at Lambeth, Jan. 10, 1554, by an error of the scribe for 1551, as appears by a certificate sent from the church to that archbishop, signifying the vacation of it.

Upon the vacancy of the church of Chichester by the deprivation of Day, the archbishop made John Worthial, archdeacon of Chichester, and Robert Taylor, LL.B. dean of the deanery of South Malling, his officials[2]. This commission to them, dated November 3, 1551, was to visit, &c.

Upon the vacancy of the church of Hereford by the death of Skip, late bishop there, the spiritualites were committed to Hugh Coren, LL.D. dean of that church, and Richard Cheney, D.D. archdeacon of Hereford. Their commission was to visit, &c.[3]

Upon the vacancy of the bishopric of Bangor,[4] either by the death of Bulkely, the bishop, or his resignation upon his blindness, the archbishop made his commissaries, Griffin

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [128, 129].
[2] [Cranm. Regist. 129.]
[3] [Cranm. Regist. 132.]
[4] [Cranm. Regist. 134, 136.]

Leyson, his principal chancellor and official; Rowland Merick, a canon of St. David's; and Geofrey Glynn, LL.D. The church of Rochester also became this year vacant by the translation of Scory to Chichester. In these vacancies the bishoprics were lamentably pilled by hungry courtiers, of the revenues belonging to them.

This year Bishop Hooper was by the council despatched down (as was said before), into his diocese, where things were much out of order, and Popery had great footing; and therefore it wanted such a stirring man as he was. That he might do the more good, he had the authority of the lords of the council to back him, by a commission granted to him and others. He brought most of the parish-priests and curates from their old superstitions and errors concerning the doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The recantation of one of them of more note, named Phelps, the incumbent of Cirencester, which he made publicly and subscribed, may be seen in the Appendix.[1]

This year there happened two learned conferences in Latin, privately managed, about the corporeal presence in the sacrament. The one on the 25th of November, in the house of Sir William Cecil, secretary of state, performed by the said Cecil; Sir John Cheke; Horne, dean of Durham; Whitehead, and Grindal, on the Protestant side: and Feckenham and Young on the Popish. But first, before they began, Cecil under his solemn protestation assured them, that every man should have free liberty to speak his mind, and that none should receive any damage or incur any danger. Cheke began by propounding this question;—"Quis esset verus et germanus sensus verborum Cœnæ, *Hoc est corpus meum?* Num quem verba sensu grammatico accepta præ se ferebant, an aliud quiddam?" To whom Feckenham answered. There were present, besides those that disputed, these noble and learned persons; the Lord Russel, Sir Anthony Coke, Mr. Hales, Mr. Wroth, Mr. Throgmartin, Mr. Knollys, Mr. Harrington. The second disputation was December 3, following, in Mr. Morison's house, where were present the marquis of Northampton, the earl of Rutland, the Lord Russel, and those above named, and Watson added on the Papists' side. Then Cheke again propounded the question, "Whether the words of the Supper are to be understood in a grammatical, or in a figurative sense?" To which Watson responded. Both these disputations are too large for this place, but they are set down in one of the manuscript volumes of the Benet library.[1]

---

[1] No. LXIII.

In November died Dr. John Redman, master of Trinity College in Cambridge, and one of the great lights of that university, for the bringing in solid learning among the students, a prebendary of the church of Westminster, and who, in the year 1549, assisted in the compiling the English book of Common Prayer, and preached a sermon upon the learned Bucer's death the day following his funeral.[2] He was a person of extraordinary reputation among all for his great learning and reading, and profound knowledge in divinity, so that the greatest divines gave a mighty deference to his judgment. And therefore, when he lay sick at Westminster, many learned men repaired to him, desiring to know his last judgment of several points, then so much controverted. And he was very ready to give them satisfaction.[3] Among the rest that came, were Richard Wilkes, master of Christ's college, Cambridge; Alexander Noel, afterwards dean of Paul's; and Young, a man of fame in Cambridge for his disputing against Bucer about justification. In these conferences with these learned men, he called the see of Rome *sentina malorum*, "a sink of evils;" he said, "that purgatory, as the schoolmen taught it, was ungodly, and that there was no such kind of purgatory as they fancied. That the offering up the sacrament in masses and trentals for the sins of the dead, was ungodly. That the wicked are not partakers of the body of Christ, but receive the outward sacrament only. That it ought not to be carried about in procession. That nothing that is seen in the sacrament, or perceived with the outward sense, is to be worshipped. That we receive not Christ's body *corporaliter*, grossly, like other meats, but so *spiritualiter*, that nevertheless *very*, *truly*. That there was not any good ground in the old doctors for transubstantiation as ever he could perceive; nor could he see what could be answered to the objections against it. That priests might by the law of God marry wives. That this proposition *Faith only justifies*, so that this faith signify a true lively faith, resting in Christ, and embracing him, is a truly, godly, sweet, and comfortable doctrine. That our works cannot deserve the kingdom of God. And," he said, "that it troubled him that he had so much strove against justification by faith only." A treatise whereof he composed, which was printed at Antwerp, after his death, in the year 1555. He said also to Young, "that *consensus ecclesiæ* was but a weak staff to lean to, and exhorted him to read the Scriptures, for there was that which would comfort him, when he should be in such a case as he was then in." One asked him concerning the doctrine of the school-doctors, that bread remained not after consecration. He replied, "there were none of the school-doctors knew what *consecratio* did mean." And, pausing awhile, said, It was *tota actio, the whole action* in ministering the sacrament, as Christ did institute it. After the conference with him was ended, Young, retiring into another chamber, said to Wilkes, that Dr. Redman so moved him, that whereas he was before in such opinion of certain things, that he would have burned and lost his life for them, now he doubted of them. "But I see," said he, "a man shall know more and more by process of time, and by reading and hearing others. And Mr. Dr. Redman's saying shall cause me to look more diligently for them." Ellis Lomas, Redman's servant, said, he knew his master had declared to King Henry, that faith only justifieth, but that he thought that doctrine was not to be taught the people, lest they should be negligent to do good works. All this I have related of this divine, that I may in some measure preserve the memory of one of the learnedest men of his time, and lay up the dying words of a Papist, signifying so plainly his dislike and disallowance of many of their doctrines.

---

[1] Miscellan. C. [C.C.C.C. No. 102, fol. 253, 259].

[2] Fox's Acts [and Monuments, vol. v. p. 600, vi. p. 267—271].

[3] Becon's Reports [Works, part iii. pp. 264, 266. Lond. 1563].

The sweating sickness breaking out this year in great violence, whereby the two sons of the duke of Suffolk were taken off, letters from the council, dated July 18, were sent to all the bishops, to persuade the people to prayer, and to see God better served.

It being enacted, 1549, that the king might, during three years, appoint sixteen spiritual men, and sixteen temporal, to examine the old ecclesiastical laws, and to compile a body of ecclesiastical laws, to be in force in the room of the old, this third year, October 6, a commission was issued out to the same number of persons, authorizing them to reform the Canon laws; that is to say, to eight bishops, eight divines, eight civil lawyers, and eight common, whose names, as they occur in an original, are as follow:—

Bishops.

The archbishop of Canterbury; the bishops of London [Ridley], Winchester [Poinet], Ely [Goodrich], Exeter [Coverdale], Gloucester [Hooper], Bath [Barlow], Rochester [Scory].

Divines.

Mr. Taylor of Lincoln; Cox, Almoner; Parker of Cambridge, Latimer, Cook [Sir Anthony, I suppose], Peter Martyr, Cheke, Johannes à Lasco.

Civilians.

Mr. Peter Cecil, Sir Thomas Smith, Taylor of Hadeligh, Dr. May, Mr. Traheron, Dr. Lyel, Mr. Skinner.

Lawyers.

Justice Hales, Justice Bromley, Goodrich, Gosnald, Stamford, Carel, Lucas, Brook, recorder of London.

It was so ordered, that this number should be divided into four distinct classes, or companies; each to consist of two bishops, two divines, two civilians, and two common lawyers. And to each company were assigned their set parts, which when one company had finished, it was transmitted to the other companies, to be by them all well considered and inspected. But out of all the number of two and thirty, eight especially were selected, from each rank two; viz. out of the bishops, the archbishop and the bishop of Ely; out of the divines, Cox and Martyr; out of the civilians, Taylor and May; out of the common lawyers, Lucas and Goodrich, to whom a new commission was made, November 9, for the first forming of the work, and preparation of the matter. And the archbishop supervised the whole work. This work they plied close this winter, but, lest they should be straitened for time, the Parliament gave the king three years longer for accomplishing this affair. So, Feb. 2, a letter was sent from the council to make a new commission to the archbishop, and to the other bishops and learned men, civilians and lawyers, for the establishment of the ecclesiastical laws, according to the act of Parliament made in the last session. This was a very noble enterprise, and well worthy the thoughts of our excellent archbishop, who with indefatigable pains had been, both in this and the last king's reign, labouring to bring this matter about; and he did his part, for he brought the work to perfection. But it wanted the king's ratification, which was delayed, partly by business, and partly by enemies.

Bishops consecrated.

August the 30th, John Scory, Poinet being translated to Winchester, was consecrated bishop of Rochester, at Croydon, by the archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by Nicholas [Ridley] bishop of London, and John suffragan of Bedford.[1]

Miles Coverdale was at the same time and place consecrated bishop of Exon, all with their surplices and copes, and Coverdale so habited also.[2]

CHAPTER XXVII.

The Articles of Religion.

Our archbishop, and certain of the bishops and other divines, but whom by name I find not, were this year chiefly busied in composing and preparing a book of Articles of Religion; which was to contain what should be publicly owned as the sum of the doctrine of the Church of England. This the archbishop had long before this bore in his mind, as excellently serviceable for the creating of a concord and quietness among men, and for the putting an end to contentions and disputes in matters of religion. These Articles the archbishop was the penner, or at least the great director of, with the assistance, as is very probable, of Bishop Ridley. And so he publicly owned afterwards, in his answer to certain interrogatories put to him by Queen Mary's commissioners; viz. that the Catechism, the book of Articles, and the book against Winchester, were his doings.[1] These Articles were in number forty-two, and were agreed to in the Convocation 1552. And in the year 1553, they were published by the king's authority both in Latin and English. After they were finished, he laboured to have the clergy subscribe them; but against their wills he compelled none; though afterwards some charged him falsely to do so, which he utterly denied, as he declared before the said queen's commissioners.[2] But to enter into some particulars concerning so eminent a matter ecclesiastical as this was.

---

[1] Cranm. Regist. [333]. [2] [Cranm. Regist. 334.]

In the year 1551, the king and his privy-council ordered the archbishop to frame a book of Articles of Religion for the preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in this Church, that, being finished, they might be set forth by public authority. The archbishop, in obedience hereunto, drew up a set of Articles, which were delivered to certain other bishops to be inspected and subscribed, I suppose, by them. Before them they lay until this year 1552. Then, May 2, a letter was sent from the council to our archbishop, to send the Articles that were delivered the last year to the bishops, and to signify whether the same were set forth by any public authority, according to the minutes. The archbishop accordingly sent the Articles, and his answer, unto the lords of the council. In September I find the articles were again in his hands. Then he set the book in a better order, and put titles upon each of the Articles, and some additions, for the better perfecting of the work, and supply of that which lacked. And so transmitted the book again from Croydon, September 19, to Sir William Cecil and Sir John Cheke, the one the king's principal secretary, and the other his tutor, being the two great patrons of the reformation at the court; desiring them together to take these Articles into their serious considerations; for he well knew them to be both wise and good men, and very well seen in divine learning. And he referred it to their wisdoms, whether they thought best to move the king's majesty therein before his coming to court; as though he conceived the king might make some demur in so weighty an affair, till he should consult with the metropolitan, in order to the coming to a resolution; or that there were some great persons about the king, that might cast some scruples and objections in his mind concerning it, which he by his presence might prevent, or be ready at hand to resolve. Cecil and Cheke thought it more convenient the archbishop should offer them to the king himself. So coming to court soon after, he delivered the book to the king, and moved him for their publishing and due observation. And so, leaving them before the king and council, they were then again delivered unto certain of the king's chaplains, who made some alterations. For I find that, "October 2, a letter was directed to Mr. Harley, Bill, Horn, Grindal, Perne, and Knox, to consider certain Articles (which must be these Articles of Religion), exhibited to the king's majesty, to be subscribed by all such as shall be admitted to be preachers or ministers in any part of the realm; and to make report of their opinions touching the same."[1]

---

[1] Fox['s Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. p. 58. There is considerable doubt respecting the authorship of the Catechism here referred to, which has been attributed to Poinet, bishop of Winchester. The whole matter may be seen discussed in the Parker Society's edition of Abp. Cranmer's Works, vol. i. p. 422].

[2] [Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. p. 58.]

The time of the year declined now towards the latter end of November, and the archbishop being retired down from Croydon to his house at Ford, near Canterbury, the privy-council, November 20, despatched, by a messenger, the Articles unto him to be reviewed, and for his last hand, that they might be presented before the Convocation, and allowed there, and so be published by the royal authority. The archbishop received the book and letter from the Council,

---

[1] Council Book [the references to which were verified from documents in the Privy-Council Office, for the Eccl. History Society's edition of this work].

November 23; and, making some notes upon it, enclosed them in a letter to the lords, and sent them, together with the book, the next day; beseeching them to prevail with the king, that all bishops should have authority to cause their respective clergy to subscribe it: and "then he trusted (as he wrote) that such a concord and quietness in religion would soon follow, as otherwise would not be in many years. And thereby God would be glorified, the truth advanced, and their lordships rewarded by him, as the setters forth of His true word and Gospel." This pious letter may be read in the Appendix.[1]

The king went a progress this summer; and the archbishop retired to Croydon, where I find him in July, August, and September. And thence, October 11, he went to Ford, to spend some time in his diocese. Now he was absent from the court, and the king abroad at that distance that he could not frequently wait upon him and be present at the Council, his enemies were at work to bring him into trouble, as we shall see by-and-bye.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Persons nominated for Irish Bishoprics.

There were certain bishoprics in Ireland about this time vacant; one whereof was that of Armagh; and it was thought convenient to have them filled by divines out of England. In the month of August the archbishop was consulted with for this; that so, by the influence of very wise and learned men, and good preachers, the Gospel might be the better propagated in that dark region. But because it was foreseen to be difficult to procure any Englishmen, so endowed, to go over thither, therefore Secretary Cecil, being then with the king in his progress, sent a letter to the archbishop at Croydon, to nominate some worthy persons for those preferments, and whom he thought would be willing to undertake them. He returned him the names of four; viz. Mr. Whitehead, of Hadley; Mr. Turner, of Canterbury; Sir Thomas Rosse, and Sir Robert Wisdome. He said, "he knew many others in England that would be meet persons for those places, but very few that would gladly be persuaded to go thither;" for it seems the English were never very fond of living in Ireland. But he added concerning these four which he had named, "that he thought they, being ordinarily called, for conscience-sake would not refuse to bestow the talent committed unto them, wheresoever it should please the king's majesty to appoint them." He recommended likewise a fifth person for this promotion, one Mr. Whitaker,[1] a wise and well-learned man (as he characters him), who was chaplain to the bishop of Winchester [Poinet]. But he doubted whether he would be persuaded to take it upon him.

---

[1] No. LXIV.

It may not be amiss to make some inquiry who and what those four before-mentioned persons were.

Mr. Whitehead was an exile in Queen Mary's reign, and pastor of the English congregation at Frankfort. And at the conference in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's government, he was one of the nine disputants on the Protestant side, and one of the appointed eight to revise the Service-Book. The writer of the "Troubles at Frankfort" mentions three, viz. Coverdale, Turner, and this Whitehead; of whom he saith, "that they were the most ancient preachers of the Gospel, and the most ancient fathers of this our country; and that from their pens, as well as their mouths, most of Queen Elizabeth's divines and bishops first received the light of the Gospel. Why Cranmer should style him Whitehead of Hadley I do not apprehend; seeing Dr. Rowland Taylor, his chaplain, was now parson of Hadley, who not long after was there burnt; and one Yeoman was Taylor's curate there, who also was afterwards burnt at Norwich.[2] But I suppose this was some other Hadley.

---

[1] I suppose this might be a slip of the archbishop's pen or memory, writing Whitacre for Goodacre, who afterwards was placed in that Irish see, and had been Poinet's chaplain.

[2] [For the narrative of Dr. Taylor's martyrdom, see Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. pp. 676—700; and for the story of Richard Yeoman, vol. viii. pp. 486—489.]

I find two about this time bearing the name of Turner, both eminent men, and preachers: the one was named William Turner, a doctor in physic, and greatly befriended by Sir John Cheke and Sir William Cecil. This man, a native of Northumberland, was the first Englishman that compiled an herbal, which was the groundwork of that which Gerarde laid the last hand unto. He was a retainer to the duke of Somerset in Edward the VI.'s time, and was physician in ordinary to his family, and the year before this, viz. 1551, I find him dean of Wells. The other was Richard Turner, a Staffordshire man, in former time curate of Chartham in Kent, and commonly called Turner of Canterbury, living in the family of Mr. Morice, the archbishop's secretary (of whom afterwards), who held the impropriation of that parsonage, and had presented this man to the vicarage. For his free and bold preaching against Popish errors, and asserting the king's supremacy, and for the extraordinary success of his ministry in bringing multitudes of people in those parts out of ignorance and superstition, he was put to much trouble and danger. He was first complained of to the king; and being brought up, the archbishop and other ecclesiastical commissioners were commanded to examine him upon certain articles. But, by the secret favour of the archbishop, and his own prudent answers, he was then discharged. Soon after, upon some false reports told of him, King Henry was so offended, that he sent for the archbishop, willing him to have him whipped out of the country. But the archbishop pacified the king, and sent him home the second time. Afterwards, a third time, his old enemies, the Popish clergy, got him convented before the privy-council, and committed for doctrines preached by him before he came into Kent. The archbishop being then down in his diocese, Turner was sent back to him with an order to recant; to whom, when his fast friend and patron, Mr. Morice, had applied himself in his behalf, the archbishop himself, being now under some cloud, dared not to interpose, because, as he then said, it had been put into the king's head that he was the great favourer and maintainer of all the heretics in the kingdom. Morice then, that he might prevent this recantation, if possible, which would have been such a reflection to the doctrine he before had preached, addressed his letters to Sir Anthony Denny, gentleman of the king's bedchamber, and Sir William Butts, his physician, relating at large Turner's case. And by their means the king became better informed of the man, and, in fine, commanded him to be retained as a faithful subject. This story is at large related by Fox.[1] And this I judge to be that Turner[2] whom the archbishop nominated for Ireland, having lived long in his diocese, and so well known to him; and whom he had, I suppose, removed to Canterbury, to a prebend, or some other preferment there. Here he did this remarkable and bold piece of service, that when, about three years past, the rebels were up in Kent, he then preached twice in the camp near Canterbury; for which the rebels were going to hang him. But God preserved him. In Queen Mary's time he fled to Basle, where he expounded upon St. James, the Hebrews, and the Ephesians, to the exiles there; when James Pilkington expounded Ecclesiastes, and both Epistles of Peter, and the Galatians; and Bentham, the Acts of the Apostles.[3]

Thomas Rosse, or Rose, was also as memorable a man, very eminent both for his preachings and sufferings. He was a west-country man, but by providence was removed into Suffolk; and at Hadley had preached against purgatory and worshipping images, about the time that Bilney and Latimer did the like in Cambridge (which was five and twenty or thirty years past); whereby he had brought many to the knowledge of the truth in that town. About the year 1532, when certain persons, out of their zeal against idolatry, had stolen by night the rood out of the church at Dover Court in Essex, for which, being found guilty of felony, they were hanged, Rose seemed to have been privy hereunto; for with the rood they conveyed away the slippers, the coat, and the tapers belonging to it, which coat Rose burnt. Whether for this, or some other thing, he was complained of to the council, and brought before them, and by [Longland] the bishop of Lincoln was committed to prison, where he lay for some days and nights with both his legs in a high pair of stocks, his body lying along on the ground. Thence he was removed to Lambeth, in the year that Cranmer was consecrated (which was 1533), who set him at liberty. Afterward he was admitted by Crumwel to be his chaplain, that thereby he might get a license to preach. After various tossings from place to place, for safety of his life, he fled into Flanders and Germany, and came to Zurich, and remained with Bullinger; and to Basle, where he was entertained by Grynæus. After some time he returned back into England, but was glad to fly beyond sea again. Three years after, in his voyage back to his own country again, he was taken prisoner by some French, and carried into Dieppe, where he was spoiled of all he had. His ransom was soon after paid by a well-disposed person, who also brought him over into England. Then the earl of Sussex received him, and his wife and child, privately into his house. But when this was known, the earl sent him a secret letter to be gone, and so he lurked in London till the death of King Henry VIII. King Edward gave him the living of West Ham, near London, in Essex. Being deprived upon Queen Mary's coming to the crown, he was sometime preacher to a congregation in London; but was taken at one of their meetings in Bow churchyard. Which, I suppose, was in the year 1555. For then he was in the Tower; and thence, in the month of May, by the Council's letters, he was delivered to the sheriff of Norfolk, to be conveyed and delivered to the bishop of Norwich, and he either to reduce him to recant, or to proceed against him according to law. Much imprisonment and many examinations he underwent, both from the bishops of Winchester and Norwich [Gardiner and Hopton], but escaped at last, by a great providence, beyond sea, where he tarried till the death of Queen Mary. And after these his harassings up and down in the world, he was at last, in Queen Elizabeth's happy reign, quietly settled at Luton in Bedfordshire, where he was preacher, and lived to a very great age.

---

[1] [Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. pp. 31—34.]

[2] [Some particulars with reference to this Richard Turner will be found in a letter of Cranmer's to Cecil, in the Parker Society's edition of his Works, vol. ii. p. 439.]

[3] Bale's Cent. [Script. Illust. Catal. p. 741, and part 2, p. 113].

The fourth was Robert Wisdome, a man eminent, as the rest, both for his exemplary conversation, and for his preaching, together with his sufferings attending thereon. In Henry the VIII.'s reign he was a person of fame among the professors of the Gospel in the south parts of the nation; whence, after many painful labours and persecutions, he fled into the north; as did divers other preachers of the pure religion in those times. There in Staffordshire he was one of those that were entertained by John Old, a pious professor, and harbourer of good men; and Thomas Becon was another, that was taken up with Bradford in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, and committed to the Tower. Of this Old the said Becon, in a treatise[1] of his, printed in Edward VI.'s reign, gives this character: "That he was to him and Wisdome, as Jason was to Paul and Silas; he received us joyfully into his house, and liberally, for the Lord's sake, ministered to our necessities, And as he begun, so did he continue, a right hearty friend, and dearly-loving brother, so long as we remained in the country."[2] While Wisdome was here, he was ever virtuously occupied, and suffered no hour to pass without some good fruit; employing himself now in writing, as he had before in preaching. Besides other books formerly writ by him, he penned here a very godly and fruitful exposition upon certain psalms of David; of the which he translated some into English metre. There is one of them, and I think no more, still remaining in our ordinary singing psalms; namely, the hundred and twenty-fifth, which in the title is said to be composed by R. W. There is also a hymn of his preserved, and set usually at the end of our English singing psalms, in our Bibles, beginning, "Preserve us, Lord, by Thy dear Word." He writ here also many godly and learned sermons upon the Epistles and Gospels, read on Sundays. He translated a postil of Antonius Corvinus, a Lutheran divine, and divers other learned men's works. And some of his adversaries having laid certain errors to his charge very unjustly, he writ a confutation thereof—a book, it seems, replenished with all kind of godly learning. These, and several other things, he writ while he was here, but they were not published.

---

[1] The Jewel of Joy. [See Parker Society's edition of Becon's Works (Catechism), &c. p. 422.]

[2] They were both forced to recant openly at St. Paul's Cross, in the year 1554, together with one Shingleton. And hereupon, I suppose, they conveyed themselves into the north parts for security.

After his abode in this place some time, he was by letters called away again among his former friends and acquaintance.[1] And what became of him afterwards, I find not; until here, in Edward the Sixth's reign, he was nominated by our archbishop to be made archbishop of Armagh. But in Queen Mary's reign he fled to Frankfort, where he remained one of the members of the English congregation there. And when an unhappy breach was made there among them, some being for the use of the Geneva discipline and form, and others for the continuance of that form of prayers that had been used in England in King Edward's days; and the faction grew to that head, that the former separated themselves from the rest, and departed to Geneva; this Wisdome did, in a sermon preached at Frankfort, vindicate the English book, and somewhat sharply blamed them that went away, calling them "madheads." As one Thomas Cole wrote from thence to a friend with this censure on him: "That he so called them, he would not say, *unwisely*, [alluding to his name, Wisdome], but he might well say, *uncharitably*."

I have thought good to give this account of these men, that we may perceive hence the good judgment of our archbishop in propounding them for those Irish preferments; so fit and well qualified for them, as in other respects of prudence and learning, so especially for their tried zeal and boldness in preaching the Gospel, and their constancy in suffering for it, which were virtues that there would be great occasion for in Ireland.

Of all these four, our Archbishop judged Mr. Whitehead the fittest, giving this character of him, "That he was endued with good knowledge, special honesty, fervent zeal, and politic wisdom." And the next to him in fitness he judged Turner, of whom he gives this relation: "That he was merry and witty withal, 'Nihil appetit, nihil ardet, nihil somniat, nisi Jesum Christum.' And, in the lively preaching of Him and His word, declared such diligence, faithfulness, and wisdom, as for the same deserveth much commendation."

In fine, Turner was the man concluded upon by the king for the archbishopric of Armagh; Whitehead either being not overcome to accept it, or otherwise designed. And the archbishop had order from court to send to Canterbury for him to come up, which accordingly he did. And now, about the middle of September, much against his will, as not liking his designed preferment, Turner waited upon the archbishop; who, urging to him the king's will and pleasure, and his ordinary call unto this place, and suchlike arguments, after a great unwillingness, prevailed with him to accept it. But the archbishop told the secretary, that Turner seemed more glad to go to hanging (which the rebels three years before were just going to do with him, for his preaching against them in their camp), than he was now to go to Armagh. He urged to the archbishop, "That if he went thither, he should have no auditors, but must preach to the walls and stalls, for the people understood no English." The archbishop, on the other hand, endeavoured to answer all his objections. He told him, "They did understand English in Ireland, though whether they did in the diocese of Armagh, he did indeed doubt. But, to remedy that, he advised him to learn the Irish tongue, which with diligence, he told him he might do in a year or two; and that there would this advantage arise thereby, that both his person and doctrine would be more acceptable, not only unto his diocese, but also throughout all Ireland." And so, by a letter to Secretary Cecil, recommended him to his care; entreating "that he might have as ready a dispatch as might be, because he had but little money."

---

[1] [See Parker Society's edition of Becon's Jewel of Joy (Catechism, &c.), pp. 422, 3.]

This letter of the archbishop is dated September 29, 1552. So that it must be a mistake in the late excellent historian, when he writes that Bale and Goodacre were sent over into Ireland to be bishops in the month of August;[1] which cannot agree with this letter of Cranmer, which makes Turner to be in nomination only for that see a month after. And by certain memorials of King Edward's own hand, which I have, it appears, that as Turner at last got himself off from accepting that bishopric, so by the date thereof it is evident, it was vacant in October following; for the king, under that month, put the providing for that place, which Turner refused, among his matters to be remembered. The archbishop's letters concerning this Irish affair are in the Appendix.[1]

---

[1] Hist. Ref. vol. i. p. 205; [vol. ii. p. 422].

So that at last this charge fell upon Hugh Goodacre, the last man, as it seems, nominated by the archbishop, whom he termed "a wise and learned man." He and Bale, as they came together out of Bishop Poinet's family unto their preferments, so they were consecrated together by Brown, archbishop of Dublin, February 2; assisted by Thomas, bishop of Kildare, and Eugenius, bishop of Down and Connor, which makes me think they were not come over long before. Goodacre died about a quarter of a year after at Dublin, and there buried, not without suspicion of poison, by procurement of certain priests of his diocese, for preaching God's verity, and rebuking their common vices, as Bale writes.[2] He left many writings of great value behind him, as the said Bale his dear friend, relates; but none, as ever I heard of, published. As he was a sober and virtuous man, so he was particularly famed for his preaching.[3] He was at first, I suppose, chaplain to the lady Elizabeth; at least to her he had been long known. And for him, about the year 1548, or 1549, she procured a licence to preach from the Protector; as appears by a letter she wrote from Enfield to Mr. Cecil, who then attended on him, of which Goodacre himself was the bearer. Wherein she gave this testimony of him: "That he had been of long time known unto her to be as well of honest conversation and sober living as of sufficient learning and judgment in the Scriptures, to preach the word of God. The advancement whereof," as she said, "she so desired, that she wished there were many such to set forth God's glory. She desired him therefore, that as heretofore, at her request, he had obtained licence to preach for divers other honest men, so he would recommend this man's case unto my lord, and therewith procure for him the like licence as to the other had been granted."

And lastly, that Goodacre and his colleague Bale might find the better countenance and authority, when they should exercise their functions in that country, the privy council wrote two letters to the lord deputy and council of Ireland; the one, dated October 27, in commendation of Bale, bishop elect of Ossory; and the other, dated November 4, in commendation of Goodacre, bishop elect of Armargh.[1]

---

[1] Nos. LXV., LXVI.

[2] Vocation of John Bale, [p. 22].

[3] "Beatæ memoriæ concionatorem in Hibernia vigilantissimum, ac theologica eloquentia non immerito commendatum. Balæi. Centur. [Illust. Vir. Catal. part ii. p. 231].

CHAPTER XXIX.

The Archbishop charged with Covetousness.

To divert the king after the loss of his uncle, whom he dearly loved, Northumberland took him in progress in the summer of this year. While he was in this progress, some about his person, that they might the better make way for their sacrilegious designs, and to make the king the more inclinable to lay hands on the episcopal demeans, or at least to clip and pare them, buzzed about the court rumours, how rich the archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops were; and withal, how niggardly and unsuitably they lived to their great incomes, laying up, and scraping together to enrich themselves and their posterities; whereby hospitality was neglected, which was especially required of them. Hereupon Sir William Cecil, the secretary, who was now with the king, and took notice of these discourses, and saw well the malicious tendency thereof (and moreover thought them perhaps in some measure to be true), laboured to hinder the ill consequence; for he was ever a very great favourer, as of the Reformed clergy, so of their estate and honours. This put him upon writing a private letter from court to the archbishop, desiring him favourably to take a piece of good counsel at his hands, as he intended it innocently and out of a good mind, acquainting him with the reports at the court of his riches, and of his covetousness; reminding him withal of that passage of St. Paul, "They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare;" meaning probably thereby, the danger that he and the rest of his brethren might expose their revenues to thereby. The archbishop seemed somewhat nettled, and perceiving the ill designs, despatched an answer hereunto, giving a true account of his own condition, and of the other bishops, as to temporal things, and letting him understand how much the world was mistaken in him and the rest: "That for himself he feared not that saying of St. Paul half so much as he did stark beggary. That he took not half so much care for his living, when he was a scholar of Cambridge, as he did at that present: for although he had now much more revenue, yet," he said, "he had much more to do withal. That he had more care now to live as an archbishop, than he had at that time to live like a scholar. That he had not now so much as he had within ten years past by an hundred and fifty pounds of certain rent, besides casualties. That he paid double for everything he bought: and that if a good auditor had this account, he should find no great surplusage to grow rich upon." And then, as for the rest of the bishops, he told him, that they were all beggars, but only one single man[1] of them: and yet he dared well say, that he was not very rich. And that if he knew any bishop that were covetous, he would surely admonish him; entreating the secretary, that, if he could inform him of any such, he would signify him, and himself would advertise him, thinking he could do it better than the other." Who seemed to have hinted his mind to the archbishop, that he intended to do it. This letter will be found among the rest in the Appendix.[2]

---

[1] Council Book.

No doubt the archbishop was thus large and earnest on this subject to supply the secretary with arguments to confute that malicious talk at court concerning the bishops, and to prevent the mischiefs hatching against them.

Nor indeed was this the first time this archbishop was thus slandered. For some of his enemies, divers years before, had charged him to his loving master, King Henry VIII., with covetousness and ill housekeeping; and the chief of these, that raised this report, was Sir Thomas Seymour. But the king made him to convince himself, by sending him to Lambeth about dinner time upon some pretended message; where his own eyes saw how the archbishop lived in far other sort than he had told the king, keeping great and noble hospitality. So that, when he returned, he acknowledged to his majesty, that he never saw so honourable a hall set in this realm, besides his majesty's, in all his life, with better order, and so well furnished in each degree. And the king then gave this testimony of him, "Ah, good man! all that he hath he spendeth in housekeeping."[1]

---

[1] He probably was Holgate, archbishop of York.

[2] No. LXVII.

For this reason probably it was, as well as upon the account of his good service, and also of the exchanges he was forced to make, that the said king gave him a promise of a grant of some lands, and by a general clause in his will signified as much; which was, "That certain persons should be considered." Accordingly I find in the forementioned manuscript-book of sales of king's lands, that Thomas archbishop of Canterbury did, in the first year of King Edward VI., partly by purchase, and partly by exchange of other lands, procure divers lands of the king. He obtained the rectory of Whalley, Blackburn, and Rochdale, in the county of Lancaster, lately belonging to the monastery or abbey of Whalley, in the same county, and divers other lands and tenements in the counties of Lancaster, Kent, Surrey, London, Bangor. And this partly in consideration of King Henry VIII.'s promise, and in performance of his will; and partly in exchange for the manor and park of Mayfield, in the county of Sussex; and divers other lands and tenements in the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Kent, Buckingham, and York. This purchase he made, I suppose, not for himself, but for his see. About the same time he also bought of the king, for the sum of five hundred and eighty pounds, eight shillings, and fourpence, the manor of Sleaford, in the county of Lincoln, and of Middleton-Cheny, in the county of Northampton, and divers other lands and tenements in the said counties. He made another purchase of the king the same year, that is, the first of his reign, for four hundred [and] twenty-nine pounds, fourteen shillings and twopence, and "for the fulfilling the last will of the late king, and in consideration of services," as it is expressed in the said book of sales. This purchase was the priory of Arthington in the county of York, and divers other lands and tenements in York, Nottingham, and Kent. An extract of which three purchases, exactly taken out of the said book, with the value of the lands, and the rent reserved, and the time of the issues, and the test of the patent, I have thought fit to insert in the Appendix,[1] which probably may not be unacceptable to curious persons.

---

[1] Fox['s Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. pp. 20, 21].

Which purchases when we consider, we might be ready to make a stand, to resolve ourselves how the archbishop could represent his condition so mean as he did in the letter beforementioned, as though he feared he should die a beggar. But it will unriddle this, if we think how the archbishopric had been fleeced by King Henry VIII. in ten years before; insomuch that the rents were less by an hundred and fifty pounds per annum, than they were before; besides the loss of fines, and other accidental benefits, as it is mentioned by the archbishop in his letter. Add those extraordinary expenses he was at in the maintenance of divines and scholars, strangers, that were exiles for religion, and the salaries and pensions, and gratuities sent to learned men abroad; besides his great and liberal housekeeping, and constant table, and large retinue.

But, to make appear more particularly in this place how King Henry pared his revenue, I will give one instance of what was passed away at one clap by exchange; which was, indeed, so considerable, that it was commonly called "The great exchange." This way of exchanging lands was much used in those times; wherein the princes commonly made good bargains for themselves, and ill ones for the bishoprics. This exchange, made by Cranmer with the king, was on the first day of December, in the twenty-ninth year of his reign, being the very year of the suppression of the greater abbeys and religious convents. They were the ancient demeans belonging to the archbishopric, consisting of many noble manors, whereof some had palaces annexed to them. I shall name only those that lay in the county of Kent, as I find them dispersed in Philipott's book of Kent.[2]

I. The manor and palace of Maidstone; which palace, Leland saith, was once a castle.[3]

II. The manor and palace of Charing.

III. Wingham.

IV. Wingham-Barton, in the parish of Alresford. But in this Philipott is mistaken; for this was let to Sir Edward Baynton for ninety-nine years, by means of the king's own solicitation to the archbishop.

---

[1] No. LXVIII.

[2] Villare Cantian.

[3] [Leland's Itinerary, vol. vii. p. 101.]

V. Wrotham.

VI. Saltwood; that had in times past a magnificent castle and park; and many manors held of it by knights' service, which made it called an honour.

VII. Tenham.

VIII. Bexley.

IX. Aldington. Where was a seat for the archbishop, a park, and a chase for deer, called Aldington-Frith. Besides Clive or Cliff; and Malingden, a manor appendant thereunto, which King Henry took away from this see and bishop, without any satisfaction, as far as I can find. Also Pinner, Hayes, Harrow, Mortlake, &c. were part of this great exchange. In lieu of these demeans passed over to the crown by way of exchange, the king conveyed several manors to the archbishop, all which had appertained to the lately dissolved religious houses. Namely, these among others:—

I. Pising; a parcel of the abbey of St. Radigunds.

II. Brandred; another manor belonging to the said abbey.

III. The college of Bredgar.

IV. Raculver; another abbey suppressed.

V. Dudmanscomb; belonging to the priory of St. Martin's in Dover.

One author, viz. Kilburn,[1] that hath wrote of Kent, makes Cranmer also to have made over to the king the sumptuous palace of Otford, built by Archbishop Warham, which cost him thirty-three thousand pounds (a vast sum in those days), as Lambard tells us.[2] Philipott, another writer of that county, saith, that this was incorporated into the revenue of the crown by the builder himself, Archbishop Warham, about the twelfth year of that king's reign, together with the magnificent seat of Knoll, near Sevenoaks; exchanging both with the king for other lands, "to extinguish the passions of such as looked with regret and desire upon the patrimony of the Church."[3] But it appears, by a

[1] [Kilburn's Topography of Kent, p. 208.]

[2] [Lambard's Perambulation of Kent, p. 377.]

[3] [Villare Cantianum, pp. 263, 319.]

writing of Cranmer's own secretary,[1] that this archbishop parted with both Otford and Knoll at once to the king, after he had possessed them some years; and not Warham, as Philipott mistakes.

The world is apt to blame Cranmer for parting with these revenues of the see. But surely it was a true apology that the author before named made for the archbishop's great exchange; namely, "Because he, finding that the spreading demeans of the Church were in danger to be torn off by the talons of avarice and rapine, to mortify the growing appetites of sacrilegious cormorants, exchanged them with the crown." Which may be enough to stop any clamours against this most reverend prelate for this his doing: especially considering what I shall add upon this argument hereafter, from his own secretary.

His care and concern for the welfare of the English church made him ever most earnestly to love the king, and to have a very tender regard for the safety of his person. Who in the summer of this year, as was hinted before, went a progress, accompanied by the duke of Northumberland;[2] brought about probably by him to get more into the king's affections, and to have his own designs the better to take effect, and with the less opposition and control, and possibly, that the king might be the further off from the archbishop to consult withal. But he had now a more especial concern upon him for his majesty at this time, as though his mind had prophetically presaged some evil to befall the king in that progress; and indeed it was the last progress that ever he made. And so methinks do these expressions of the archbishop sound, in a letter, dated in July, to Cecil, then attending the court; "beseeching Almighty God to preserve the king's majesty, with all his council and family, and send him well to return from his progress." And in a letter the next month, "he thanked Cecil for his news; but especially," said he, "for that ye advertise me that the king's majesty is in good health, wherein I beseech God long to continue his highness." And when, in the latter end of the following month, the gests (that is, the stages of his majesty's progress) were altered, which looked like some ill design, the archbishop entreated Cecil to send him the new resolved-upon gests from that time to the end, that he might from time to time know where his majesty was; adding his prayer again for him, "that God would preserve and prosper him."

---

[1] MSS. C.C.C.C. [No. 129].

[2] [See above, p. 404.]

CHAPTER XXX.

His care for the Vacancies. Falls sick.

WHILE the king was thus abroad, and the archbishop absent, unworthy or disaffected men were in a fairer probability of getting promotions in the Church, while he was not at hand for to nominate fit men to the king, and to advise him in the bestowing the vacant dignities and benefices. The archbishop knew very well how much learning and sobriety contributed towards the bringing the nation out of popery, and that nothing tended so effectually to continue it as the contrary. This matter the archbishop seemed to have discoursed at large with Secretary Cecil at parting, who therefore, by a letter sent to the said archbishop, then at his house at Ford, desired him to send him up a catalogue of learned men, and such as he esteemed fit for places of preferment in the church and university; that so, as any place fell in the king's gift, the said secretary might be ready at the least warning to recommend fitting and worthy men to supply such vacancies, and to prevent any motion that might be made by any courtiers or simonists for ignorant persons, or corrupt in religion. In answer to which letter, the archbishop writ him word that he would send him his mind in that matter with as much expedition as he could. And undoubtedly we should have seen the good fruits of this afterwards in the Church, had not the untimely death of that admirable prince, that followed not long after, prevented this good design.

This year the archbishop laboured under two fits of sickness at Croydon. The latter was caused by a severe ague, of which his physicians doubted whether it were a quotidian, or a double-tertian; and, seizing him in the declining of the year, was in danger to stick by him all the winter. But, by the care of his physicians, in the latter end of August, it had left him two days, which made him hope he was quit thereof; yet his water kept of a high colour. That second day he wrote to Cecil, and "desired him to acquaint Cheke how it was with him. And now the most danger was," as he said, "that if it came again that night, it was like to turn to a quartan, a most stubborn ague, and likelier to continue and wear him out." A disease, indeed, that carried off his successor, Cardinal Pole, and was, as Godwin observed,[1] a disease deadly and mortal unto elder folk.

The archbishop's friends had reason to fear his distemper, if we think of the severity of agues in that age; greater, as it seems, than in this. Roger Ascham complaineth to his friend John Sturmius, anno 1562, "that, for four years past, he was afflicted with continual agues: that no sooner had one left him, but another presently followed; and that the state of his health was so impaired and broke by them, that an hectic fever seized his whole body, and the physicians promised him some ease, but no solid remedy."[2] And I find, six or seven years before that, mention made of hot burning fevers, whereof died many old persons; and that there died in the year 1556, seven aldermen within the space of ten months. And the next year, about harvest time, the quartan agues continued in like manner, or more vehemently than they had done the year before; and they were chiefly mortal to old people, and especially priests: so that a great number of parishes became destitute of curates, and none to be gotten; and much corn was spoiled for lack of harvest-men. Such was the nature of this disease in these days.[3]

But the severity or danger of the archbishop's distemper did not so much trouble him, as certain inconveniences that attended it; viz. that it put him off from those pious and holy designs that he was in hand with, for God's glory, and the good of the Church. For so he expressed his mind to his friend the secretary: "However the matter chance, the most grief to me is, that I cannot proceed in such matters as I have in hand, according to my will and desire: this *terrenum domicilium* is such an obstacle to all good purposes." So strongly bent was the heart of this excellent prelate to the serving of God and His church. But out of this sickness he escaped; for God had reserved him for another kind of death to glorify Him by.

---

[1] [See Godwin, De Præsul. vol i. p. 151.]
[2] [Epist. R. Ascham, p. 79.]
[3] Stow's Chron. [pp. 628, 634].

A little before this sickness befel him, something fell out which gave him great joy. Cecil knew how welcome good news out of Germany would be to him, and therefore in July sent him a copy of the Pacification [of Passau];[1] that is, the emperor's declaration of peace throughout the empire, after long and bloody wars, which consisted of such articles as were favourable unto the Protestants, after much persecution of them: "as, that a diet of the empire should shortly be summoned, to deliberate about composing the differences of religion; and that the dissensions about religion should be composed by placid, and pious, and easy methods. And that in the mean time all should live in peace together, and none should be molested for religion; with divers other matters."[2] And in another letter, soon after, the said Cecil advised him of a peace concluded between the emperor and Maurice, elector of Saxony, a warlike prince, and who headed the Protestant army, which being news of peace among Christians, was highly acceptable to the good father. But he wanted much to know upon what terms, out of the concern he had that it might go well with the Protestest interest; and therefore, Cecil having not mentioned them, the archbishop earnestly, in a letter to him, desired to know whether the peace were according to the articles, meaning those of the Pacification, or otherwise; which when he understood (for upon the same articles that peace between the emperor and Duke Maurice stood), it created a great tranquillity to his pious mind. Thus were his thoughts employed about the matters of Germany, and the cause of religion there, which he rejoiced not a little to see in so fair a way to a good conclusion.

---

[1] [See Parker Society's edition of Archbishop Cranmer's Works, vol. ii. p. 437.]

[2] Vid. Sleid. [De Statu. Relig. &c.] lib. xxiv. [p. 562].

CHAPTER XXXI.

His kindness for Germany.

To this country he had a particular kindness, not only because he had been formerly there in quality of ambassador from his master King Henry, and had contracted a great friendship with many eminent learned men there, and a near relation to some of them by marrying Osiander's niece at Nuremburg; but chiefly, and above all, because here the light of the Gospel began first to break forth and display itself, to the spiritual comfort and benefit of other nations. He had many exhibitioners in those parts, to whom he allowed annual salaries, insomuch that some of his officers grumbled at it, as though his housekeeping were abridged by it. For when once in King Henry's reign, one, in discourse with an officer of his grace, had said, "He wondered his lordship kept no better an house" (though he kept a very good one): he answered, "It was no wonder, for my lord," said he, "hath so many exhibitions in Germany, that all is too little to scrape and get to send thither."

He held at least a monthly correspondence to and from learned Germans, and there was one in Canterbury, appointed by him on purpose to receive and convey the letters, which his enemies once, in his troubles, made use of as an article against him. And Gardiner, a prebend of Canterbury, and preferred by the archbishop, of this very thing treacherously, in a secret letter, informed his grand enemy and competitor Gardiner, the bishop of Winton.

Among the rest of his correspondents in Germany, Herman, the memorable and ever-famous archbishop and elector of Cologne, was one, who, by the counsel and direction of Bucer and Melancthon, did vigorously labour a reformation of corrupt religion within his province and territories. But, finding the opposition against him so great, and lying under the excommunication of the pope for what he had done, and, being deprived thereupon by the emperor of his lands and function, he resigned his ecclesiastical honour, and betook himself to a retired life: which was done about the year 1547. But no question, in this private capacity, he was not idle in doing what service he could for the good of that cause, which he had so generously and publicly espoused, and for which he had suffered so much. I find that, in this year 1552, our archbishop had sent a message to Secretary Cecil, who accompanied the king in this summer's progress, desiring him to be mindful of the bishop of Cologne's letters. And in another letter, dated July 21, he thanked the secretary for the good remembrance he had thereof. What the contents of these letters of the archbishop of Cologne were, it appeareth not: but I am very apt to think the purport of them was, that Cranmer would solicit some certain business in the English court, relating to the affairs of religion in Germany, and for the obtaining some favour from the king in that cause. But the king being now abroad, and the archbishop at a distance from him, he procured the secretary, who was ever cordial to the state of religion, to solicit that archbishop's business for him, sending him withal that archbishop's letters for his better instruction.

And this, whatever it was, seems to have been the last good office that Archbishop Herman did to the cause of religion; for he died, according to Sleidan,[1] in the month of August; and our archbishop's letter, wherein that elector's letters are mentioned, was writ but the month before.

And if one may judge of men's commencing friendship and love according to the suitableness of their tempers and dispositions, our archbishop of Canterbury and the archbishop of Cologne, must have been very intimate friends. It was said of this man, that he often wished, "That either he might be instrumental to the propagating the evangelical doctrine and reformation of the churches under his jurisdiction, or to live a private life." And when his friends had often told him what envy he would draw upon himself by the changing of religion, he would answer like a true Christian philosopher, "That nothing could happen to him unexpectedly, and that he had long since fortified his mind against every event." These two passages spake the very spirit and soul of Cranmer, which they may see that are minded to read what Fox saith of him,[1] as to his undauntedness and constancy in the maintaining of the truth, against the many temptations and dangers that he met with during these three reigns successively.

---

[1] [De Statu. Relig. &c. lib. xxiv. p. 572.]

And lastly, as our archbishop devoted himself wholly to the reforming of his church; so admirable was the diligence, pains, and study this archbishop took in contriving the reformation of his. He procured a book to be writ concerning it, called "Instauratio Ecclesiarum," which contained the form and way to be used for the redressing the errors and corruptions of his church. It was composed by those great German divines, Bucer and Melancthon; which book was put into English, and published here, as a good pattern, in the year 1547. This book he intended to issue forth through his jurisdiction, by his authority to be observed. But first he thought fit well and seriously to examine it; and spent five hours in the morning, for five days, to deliberate and consult thereupon, calling to him, to advise withal in this great affair, his coadjutor Count Stolberg, Husman, Jenep, Bucer, and Melancthon. He caused the whole work to be read before him; and as many places occurred wherein he seemed less satisfied, he caused the matter to be disputed and argued, and then spake his own mind accurately. He would patiently hear the opinions of others for the information of his own judgment; and so ordered things to be either changed or illustrated. And so dexterously would he decide many controversies arising, that Melancthon thought that those great points of religion had been long weighed and considered by him, and that he rightly understood the whole doctrine of the Church. He had always lying by him the Bible of Luther's version; and, as testimonies chanced to be alleged thence, he commanded that they should be turned to, that he might consider that which is the fountain of all truth; insomuch that the said Melancthon could not but admire and talk of his learning, prudence, piety, and dexterity, to such as he conversed with; and particularly to John Cæsar, to whom in a letter he gave a particular account of this affair.[2] And it is to be noted by the way that the said book, according to which the Reformation was to be modelled, contained only, as Melancthon in his letter suggested, a necessary instruction for all children, and the sum of the Christian doctrine; and the appointments for the colleges and ecclesiastical hierarchy were very moderate; the form of the ecclesiastical polity being to remain as it was, and so were the colleges, with their dignities, wealth, degrees, ornaments, thereunto belonging; only great superstitions should be taken away. Which the wise Melancthon aforesaid did so approve of, that he professed he had often propounded it in diets of the German nation, as the best way to peace.[1] And this I add, that it might be observed how Archbishop Cranmer went by the same measures in the Reformation of the church of England; maintaining the hierarchy, and the revenues, dignities, and customs of it, against many in those times that were for the utter abolishing them, as relics of popery. Such a correspondence there was between our archbishop and the wisest, moderatest, and most learned divines of Germany. But let us look nearer home.

---

[1] [See Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. p. 22.]

[2] Mel. Epist. printed at Leyden, 1647, p. 34.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Troubles of Bishop Tunstal.

As the last year we heard of the deprivation of two Popish bishops, so this year another underwent the like censure; I mean Tunstal, bishop of Durham; whose business I shall the rather relate, because our archbishop had some concern in it. September 21, "A commission was issued out to the lord chief justice and his colleagues, to examine and determine the cause of Tunstal, bishop of Durham, and eight writings touching the same, which he is willed to consider, and to proceed to the hearing and ordering of the matter, as soon as he may get the rest of his colleagues to him."[2] It was not long after, viz. about the midst of October, that this bishop by these commissioners (whose names, besides the chief justice, do not occur), was deprived, and his estate confiscated. "October ult. Sir John Mason was ordered by the council to deliver to the use of Dr. Tunstal (so he is now styled), remaining prisoner in the Tower, such money as should serve for his necessities, until such time as further order shall be taken touching his goods and money, lately appertaining to him. December 6, it was agreed by the council, that Dr. Tunstal, late bishop of Durham, should have the liberty of the Tower;" where he continued till the time of Queen Mary.

---

[1] "Nec aliam video, nisi hanc unam, ut retineant episcopi et collegia suæ ἀξιώματα, et suas opes, et recipiant doctrinam piam." *Ubi supra.*

[2] MS. of an old Council Book.

But we will look back to learn for what cause this severe punishment was inflicted upon this reverend grave bishop; and the rather, because the bishop of Sarum could not find, as he writes, what the particulars were.[1] In the year 1550, a conspiracy was hatching in the north, to which the bishop was privy at least, if not an abettor; and he wrote to one Menvile in those parts relating to the same. This Menvile himself related unto the council, and produced the bishop's letter, which was afterwards, by the duke of Somerset, withdrawn and concealed, as it seems, out of kindness to Tunstal. But upon the duke's troubles, when his cabinet was searched, this letter was found, upon which they proceeded against Tunstal. This is the sum of what is found in the council-book; viz. "May 20, 1551, the bishop of Durham is commanded to keep his house. Aug. 2, he had licence to walk in the fields. December 20. Whereas the bishop of Durham, about July 1550. was charged by Vivian Menvile to have consented to a conspiracy in the north, for the making a rebellion; and whereas, for want of a letter written by the said bishop to the said Menvile (whereupon great trial of this matter depended), the final determination of the matter could not be proceeded unto, and the bishop only commanded to keep his house; the same letter hath of late been found in a casket of the duke of Somerset's after his last apprehension. The said bishop was sent for, and this day appeared before the council, and was charged with the letter, which he could not deny but to be his own hand-writing; and, having little to say for himself, he was then sent to the Tower, there to abide till he should be delivered by process of law." Agreeable to this is that King Edward writes in his Journal: "December 20, the bishop of Durham was, for concealment of treason written to him, and not disclosed, sent to the Tower."

---

[1] [Burnet's Hist. of Reformat. vol. ii. p. 401.]

In the latter end of the year 1551, a Parliament sitting, it was thought convenient to bring in a bill into the House of Lords, attainting him for misprision of treason. But Archbishop Cranmer spake freely against it, not satisfied, it seems, with the charge laid against him. But it passed, and the archbishop protested. But when it was carried down to the Commons, they would not proceed upon it, not satisfied with the bare depositions of evidences, but required that the accusers might be brought face to face, and so it went no further. But when the Parliament would not do Tunstal's business, a commission was issued out to do it, as is above spoken.

In the mean time, that the bishopric might not want a due care taken of it during the bishop's restraint, February 18, 1551, a letter was sent from the council to the prebendaries of Durham, to conform themselves to such orders in religion and divine service, standing with the king's proceedings, as their dean, Mr. Horne, shall set forth, whom the lords required them to receive and use well, as being sent to them for the weal of the country by his majesty.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

The new Common Prayer. The Archbishop in Kent.

THE book of Common Prayer having the last year been carefully revised and corrected by the archbishop and others, the Parliament in April this year enacted, that it should begin to be used everywhere at All-Saints day next. And accordingly the book was printed against the time, and began to be read in St. Paul's Church, and the like throughout the whole city. But because the posture of kneeling was excepted against by some, and the words used by the priest to the communicant, at the reception of the bread, gave scruple, as though the adoration of the host were intended: therefore, to take off this, and to declare the contrary to be the doctrine of this church, October 27, a letter was sent from the council to the lord chancellor, to cause to be joined to the book of Common Prayer, lately set forth, a declaration, signed by the king, touching the kneeling at the receiving of the communion. Which in all probability was done by the motion of the archbishop, who, in his late book, had taken such pains to confute the adoration; and now thought it necessary, that some public declaration should be made in the church service against it. So now, the first of November being come, Dr. Ridley, the bishop of London, was the first that celebrated the new service in St. Paul's Church, which he did in the forenoon, and then, in his rochet only, without cope or vestment, preached in the choir.[1] And in the afternoon he preached at Paul's Cross, the lord mayor and aldermen, and citizens, present. His sermon tended to the setting forth this new edition of the Common Prayer. He continued preaching till almost five o'clock; so that the mayor and the rest went home by torch-light. By this book of Common Prayer all copes and vestments were forbidden throughout England. The prebendaries of St. Paul's left off their hoods, and the bishops their crosses, &c. as by act of Parliament is more at large set forth.

Provision also was made for the king's French dominions, that this book, with the amendments, should be used there. And [Goodrich] the bishop of Ely, lord chancellor, a great forwarder of good reformation, procured a learned Frenchman, who was a doctor of divinity, carefully to correct the former French book by this English new one, in all the alterations, additions, and omissions thereof. For the first Common Prayer-book also was in French, for the use of the king's French subjects; being translated by commandment of Sir Hugh Paulet, governor of Calais; and that translation overseen by the lord chancellor and others at his appointment. The benefit of this last book was such that one of the French congregation in London sought, by the means of à Lasco's interest with Secretary Cecil, for a licence under the king's letters patents, to translate this Common Prayer, and the administration of sacraments, and to print it, for the use of the French islands of Jersey and Guernsey. But Cecil, after a letter received from à Lasco in August to that effect, not willing to do this of his own head, and reckoning it a proper matter to be considered by the archbishop, who were to be intrusted with the translating of such a book, desired him, being now at Ford, to give him his advice and judgment herein, both as to the work and as to the benefit. To whom the archbishop gave this answer; "That the commodity that might arise by printing of the book was meet to come to them, who had already taken the pains in translating the same." Informing the secretary who they were; namely, those formerly and now of late employed by Sir Hugh Paulet, and [Goodrich] the lord chancellor. But I find this book was not presently finished, being not printed till the year 1553, for the use of Jersey and Guernsey.

---

[1] Stow's Chron. [p. 608].

Notwithstanding this cleansing of the Church from superstition and idolatry, and bringing in the knowledge of the Gospel, by the archbishop's constant pains and study, the people generally, even the professors themselves, were bad enough as to their morals; and religion had yet got but little hold of them. A clear sight of the behaviour of these times may be seen by what Thomas Becon, a chaplain of Cranmer's, writ in his preface to a book put forth in those days: "What a nomber of fals Christians lyve ther at thys present day, unto the excedynge dishonour of the Christen profession, which with theyr mouth confesse that they know God, but with theyr dedes they utterly denye hym, and are abhominable, disobedient to the word of God, and utterlye estranged from al good works? What a swarm of grosse gospellers have we also among us, which can prattle of the Gospel very fynely, talk much of the justification of faith, crake very stoutly of the free remissyon of all theyr sins by Christ's blood, avaunce themselves to be of the number of those, which are predestinate unto eternal glory? But how far do theyr life differ from all true Christianitie? They are puffed up with al kynd of pryde; they swel with al kynd of envy, malice, hatred, and enmity against theyr neghbour, they brenne with unquencheable lusts of carnal concupiscence, they walowe and tumble in al kynd of beastly pleasures: theyr gredy covetous affects are insatiable: thenlarging of theyr lordshipps, thencreasyng of theyr substance, the scrapyng together of theyr worldly possessions infynite, and knoweth no end. In fyne, all theyr endeavours tend unto thys end, to show themselves very ethnycks, and utterly estraunged from God in theyr conversation, although in words they otherwise pretend. As for theyr almes-dedes, theyr praying, theyr watchyng, theyr fastyng, and such other godly exercises of the spirit, they are utterly banished from these rude and gross gospellers. All theyr religion consisteth in words and disputations; in Christen acts and godly dedes nothyng at all."[1] These evil manners of the professors themselves looked with so sad a face, that it made the best men assuredly expect a change, and woful times to follow.

September 27, a letter was sent from the council to the archbishop to examine a sect newly sprung up in Kent. Whereof there was now a book of examinations sent him:[2] and to commune with a man and a woman, (the informers), bearers of the letter, who could inform him somewhat of the matter. And to take such order in the same according to the commission, that these errors might not be suffered thus to overspread the king's faithful subjects. What this sect was, appeareth not. The Anabaptists were taken notice of, and a commission issued out against them, some years before. These were sectaries more new, and whereof the council very lately was informed. It may be they were of the family of Love, or David George's sect, who made himself sometime Christ, and sometime the Holy Ghost. For a little before these times, divers sects sprang up under the profession of the Gospel, in High and Low Germany; some whereof dispersed themselves into England. Which sects began to do so much hurt to the Reformation among us, that the author before mentioned laments it in these words:—"What wicked and ungodly opinions are there sown now-a-days of the Anabaptists, Davidians, Libertines, and such other pestilent sects, in the hearts of the people, unto the great disquietness of Christ's Church, moving rather unto sedition, than unto pure religion; unto heresy, than unto things godly!"[3]

---

[1] [Jewel of Joy. See Parker Society's edition of Becon's Works (Catechism, &c.), p. 415.]

[2] Council Book.

[3] [See Becon's Works, as above, at note 1.]

The examination of this new sect was one of the businesses the archbishop was employed in while he was in his retirement at his house near Canterbury. Another was, the sitting upon a commission to him, and other gentlemen of Kent, for inquiry after such as had embezzled the plate and goods belonging to chantries, &c. given by the Parliament to the king, and converting them to their own uses. But this being somewhat an odious work, he was not very forward to enter upon, especially because he thought, whatsoever he and the other commissioners should recover, would be but swallowed up by the duke of Northumberland and his friends, and the king be little the better. But, because he did not make more haste he was charged by his enemies at court as a neglecter of the king's business. Which cost him a letter in excuse of himself to the said duke, signifying that he omitted this business awhile till the gentlemen and justices of peace of Kent, who were then mostly at London, were come home.

December 2, a letter was sent from the council to the archbishop, to grant out a warrant, *ad installandum*, for [Hooper] the bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, without paying any fees for the same; because he paid fees for another mandate, which served to no purpose.[1]

February 20, an order was sent to the archbishop from the council to examine the vicar of Beedon, in the county of Berks, according to an information enclosed, and to advertise the lords of his proceedings therein.[1] What this vicar's crime was I know not; but I observe about these times the priests and curates were very busy men, and would take liberty, sometimes to speak against the king's proceedings, or his archbishop, with bitterness enough, and sometimes to vent fond opinions, so that oftentimes they were fetched up to the council-board; and, after an appearance or two, referred to the archbishop to examine and punish, as being matters relating to religion; and so proper for his cognizance.

About the latter end of this year, Thomas Sampson was preferred to the deanery of Chichester, having been parson of All-Hallows, Bread-street, London. February the 2nd, a letter was sent from the privy-council to the archbishop, to bestow the said living upon Mr. Knox, who was one of the king's chaplains, and in good esteem in the court for his gift of preaching.

---

[1] Council Book.

This Knox was the man whose name was so dashed in the king's Journal, where the names of the king's six chaplains were inserted, that Bishop Burnet could not read it.[1] The council bare a great favour to him, as appears by those several letters they wrote in his behalf. One was mentioned before, sent to the archbishop for a living in London; but in that Knox succeeded not, the archbishop preferring Laurence Saunders, afterwards a martyr, thereunto. Knox being sent this year into the north one of the king's itinerary preachers, a warrant, dated October 27,[2] was granted from the council to four gentlemen, to pay to him, his majesty's preacher in the north (so he is styled), forty pounds, as his majesty's reward. And again, December 9, a letter was sent from the council to the Lord Wharton, who was lord warden in the northern borders, in commendation of Mr. Knox. And the next year, viz. [June 2], 1553, being returned out of the north, and being then in Buckinghamshire, that he might find the more acceptance and respect there, the council wrote a letter to the great men in those parts, viz. the Lord Russel, Lord Windsor, to the justices of the peace, and the rest of the gentlemen within that county, in favour of the said Knox, the preacher.

A Bishop consecrated.

June 26, John Taylor, S. T. P. dean of Lincoln,[3] a learned and pious man, was consecrated bishop of Lincoln, at Croyden chapel, by the archbishop; assisted by Nicolas [Ridley], bishop of London; and John [Scory], bishop of Rochester.

---

[1] Collect. vol. ii. p. 42 [vol. ii. part 2, p. 43. Notwithstanding that Knox has been hitherto supposed to have been one of Edward VI.'s chaplains, upon the authority of Burnet, of which Strype availed himself, it is now positively proved that his was not the name "dashed, in the king's Journal," the editor of this work for the Eccl. History Society, with the assistance of Sir Frederic Madden, having discovered that the name erased was "Eastwick," and not "Knox."]

[2] Council Book.

[3] [Cranm. Reg. 335.]

CHAPTER XXXIV.

A Catechism. The Archbishop opposeth the Exclusion of the Lady Mary.

We are now come to the last year of good King Edward's reign, when the archbishop was as commonly at the council as he used to be before. For the counsellors made great use of him, and did not use to conclude anything in matters relating to the Church without him. And if he came not, they often sent for him, and once the last year, in October, when he had fixed his day of going into Kent, they stayed him for some days, that they might confer with him about some certain matter; I suppose, relating to the Articles of Religion, that were then under their hands. To look no further than the latter end of the last year; he was at council at Westminster in February, and this year in March and April. And the court being at Greenwich, where the king lay sick, and died, the archbishop was there at council in June, but not after the eighth day. The reason he came no more we may well conjecture to be, because he did no-ways like the methods that were now taking by Northumberland to bring the crown into his own family, and disinherit the king's sisters. For soon after, viz. June 11, the Lord Chief Justice Montague, and some other judges, with the king's attorney and solicitor, were sent for to the council to consult about drawing up the instrument.

On one of these council-days he procured the king's letters in behalf of the book of Articles, which he had taken such pains about the two last years, both in composing and in bringing to effect. The king had before given order to the archbishop, by his letters, to put forth these Articles. And now they were put forth, he procured the king's letters also to his own officers, for to see the clergy of his diocese to subscribe thereunto. So the king's letters were directed to the official of the court of Canterbury, and the dean of the deanery of the Arches, and to their surrogates, deputies, &c. setting forth, "That whereas he had given order unto Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, in letters sealed with his signet, for the honour of God, and to take away dissension of opinion, and confirm consent of true religion, that he should expound, publish, denounce, and signify some articles and other things, breathing the right faith of Christ, for the clergy and people within his jurisdiction; the king therefore enjoined them, the archbishop's officers, that they should cause all rectors, vicars, priests, stipendiaries, schoolmasters, and all that had any ecclesiastical employment, to appear in person before the archbishop in his hall at Lambeth, there further to obey and do, on the king's part, according as it shall be signified, and to receive according to reason, and the office owing to the king's royal dignity."[1] And in obedience hereunto, the official, John Gibbon, LL.D. commissary of the deanery of the blessed Virgin of the Arches, signified by an instrument dated June 2, to the archbishop, that he had cited the clergy. I do not find the success of this; only that the city clergy made their appearance before the archbishop at Lambeth, and that he did his endeavour, by persuasion and argument, to bring them to subscribe, which, no question, very few refused. But this matter afterwards served Queen Mary's commissioners for one of their interrogatories to be put to the archbishop, as though he had compelled many against their wills to subscribe, which he denied, saying, he compelled none; but exhorted such to subscribe as were willing first to do it, before they did it.

In the month of May, the king by his letters patent commanded a Latin catechism to be taught by schoolmasters to their scholars. It was entitled, "Catechismus brevis, Christianæ disciplinæ summam continens." The king in his letters, dated May 20, said, "it was made by a certain pious and learned man, and presented to him; and that he committed the diligent examination of it to certain bishops and other learned men, whose judgment was of great authority with him." The same bishops and learned men, I suppose, that were framing and preparing the Articles of Religion the last year. The author of this Catechism is not certainly known: some conjecture him to be Poinet, the bishop of Winchester. The learned Dr. Ward, one of the

---

[1] Cranmer's Regist. [65].

English divines sent to the synod of Dort, having this Catechism in his library (now in the possession of a friend of mine), wrote therein these words; "A^{ro} N^{llo} autore, siquid ego divinare possum:" meaning probably Alexander Nowel, who was now, if I mistake not, schoolmaster of Westminster, and afterwards dean of St. Paul's. But whosoever was the author, the archbishop we may conclude to be the furtherer and recommender of it unto the king: it being that prelate's great design by catechisms, and articles of religion, and plain expositions of the fundamentals, to instil right principles into the minds of the youth and common people, for the more effectual rooting out Popery, that had been so long entertained by the industrious nurselling up the nation in ignorance.

There was a Catechism that came forth about this time, (whether it were this or another, I cannot say), allowed by the Synod, or Convocation. In the beginning of Queen Mary the popish divines made a great stir about this Catechism, and thought they had a great advantage against it, because it was put forth as from the Synod, whereas that synod knew nothing of it. Whereupon Weston, the prolocutor in Queen Mary's first Convocation, brought a bill into the house, declaring that Catechism, being pestiferous and full of heresies, to be foisted upon the last synod fraudulently, and therefore that the present Synod disowned it. To which he set his own hand, and propounded that all the house should do the like, which all but six consented to. One whereof was Philpot, archdeacon of Winchester, who stood up and told them, in justification of those that published the said Catechism, that the Synod, under King Edward, had granted to certain persons, to be appointed by the king, to make ecclesiastical laws. And whatsoever ecclesiastical laws they or the most part of them did set forth, according to a statute in that behalf provided, might well be said to be done by the Synod of London; although such as were of the house then had no notice thereof before the promulgation. And therefore in this point he thought the setters forth of the Catechism had nothing slandered the house, since they had that Synodal authority unto them committed. And moreover he desired the prolocutor would be a means unto the lords, that some of those that were learned, and the publishers of this book, might be brought into the house, to show their learning that moved them to set forth the same; and that Dr. Ridley, and Rogers, and two or three more, might be licensed to be present at this disputation, and be associate with them. But this would not be allowed.[1]

The last thing we hear of concerning our archbishop in this king's reign was, his denial to comply with the new settlement of the crown, devised and carried on by the domineering duke of Northumberland, for the succession of Jane, daughter to Gray, duke of Suffolk, whom he had married to one of his sons. This he did both oppose, and, when he could not hinder, refused to have any hand in it. First, he did his endeavour to stop this act of the king. He took the boldness to argue much with the king about it once, when the marquis of Northampton, and the Lord Darcy, lord chamberlain, were present. And moreover he signified his desire to speak with the king alone, that so he might be more free and large with him. But that would not be suffered: but if it had, he thought he should have brought off the king from his purpose, as he said afterward. But, for what he had said to the king, the duke of Northumberland soon after told him at the council-table, "That it became him not to speak to the king as he had done, when he went about to dissuade him from his will." To the council the archbishop urged the entailing of the crown by King Henry upon his two daughters, and used many grave and pithy reasons to them for the Lady Mary's legitimation, when they argued against it. But the council replied, "That it was the opinion of the judges, and the king's learned council in the law, that that entailing could not be prejudicial unto the king; and that he, being in possession of the crown, might dispose of it as he would." This seemed strange unto the archbishop: yet, considering it was the judgment of the lawyers, and he himself unlearned in the law, he thought it not seemly to oppose this matter further. But he refused to sign, till the king himself required him to set his hand to his will, and saying, "that he hoped he alone would not stand out, and be more repugnant to his will than all the rest of the council were." Which words made a great impression upon the archbishop's tender heart, and grieved him very sore, out of the dear love he had to that king; and so he subscribed. And, when he did it, he did it unfeignedly. All this he wrote unto Queen Mary.[1]

---

[1] Fox [Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 395, *et seq.*].

To which I will add what I meet with in one of my manuscripts.[2] "When the council and the chief judges had set their hands to the king's will, last of all they sent for the archbishop, [who had all this while stood off], requiring him also to subscribe the same will, as they had done. Who answered, that he might not without perjury: for so much as he was before sworn to my Lady Mary by King Henry's will. To whom the council answered, that they had consciences as well as he, and were also as well sworn to the king's will as he was. The archbishop answered, I am not judge over any man's conscience, but mine own only. For as I will not condemn their fact, no more will I stay my fact upon your conscience, seeing that every man shall answer to God for his own deeds, and not for other men's. And so he refused to subscribe, till he had spoken with the king herein. And being with the king, he told the archbishop, that the judges had informed him, that he might lawfully bequeath his crown to the Lady Jane, and his subjects receive her as queen, notwithstanding their former oath to King Henry's will. Then the archbishop desired the king, that he might first speak with the judges, which the king gently granted. And he spake with so many of them as were at that time at the court, and with the king's attorney also, who all agreed in one, that he might lawfully subscribe to the king's will by the laws of the realm. Whereupon he returning to the king, by his commandment granted at last to set his hand."

From the whole relation of this affair we may note, as the honesty, so the stoutness and courage of the archbishop, in the management of himself in this cause against Northumberland, who hated him, and had of a long time sought his ruin, and the ingratitude of Queen Mary, or at least the implacableness of Cranmer's enemies; that the queen soon yielded her pardon to so many of the former king's council, that were so deep and so forward in this business, but would not grant it him, who could not obtain it till after much and long suit; and that it should be put into two acts of her parliament (to make him infamous for a traitor to posterity) that he and the duke of Northumberland were the devisers of this succession, to deprive Queen Mary of her right: which was so palpably false and untrue on the archbishop's part. But this was, no question, Winchester's doing; through whose hands, being now Lord Chancellor, all these acts of Parliament passed, and the wording of them.

---

[1] [This letter will be found in Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii. pp. 67, 68.]

[2] Foxii MSS. [Harl. MSS. ccccxvii. 91].

Finally, I have only one thing more to add concerning this matter, which is, that, besides the instrument of succession, drawn up by the king's council learned in the law, signed by himself and thirty-two counsellors, and dated June 21, according to the History of the Reformation, there was another writing, which was also signed by twenty-four of the council.[1] And to this I find our archbishop's name. Herein they promised by their oaths and honours (being commanded so to do by the king), to observe all and every article contained in a writing of the king's own hand, touching the said succession, and after copied out and delivered to certain judges and learned men to be written in order. This writing thus signed, with the other writing of the king, being his devise for the succession, may be seen in the Appendix,[2] as I drew them out of an original.

CHAPTER XXXV.

The King dies.

THE good king made his most Christian departure July the 6th, to the ineffable loss of religion and the kingdom; being in all likelihood, by his early beginnings, to prove an incomparable prince to the English nation. It was more than whispered that he died by poison; and, however secretly this was managed, it was very remarkable, that this rumour ran not only after his death, but, even a month or two before it, reports spread that he was dead. For which, as being rash speeches against the king, they studiously took up many people, and punished them. Before his father King Henry had him, his only son lawfully begotten, it was twenty-eight years from his first entrance upon his kingdom. And this heir made amends for the nation's so long expectation of a prince: "His singular excellency in all kind of princely towardliness, to use the words of one who lived in those times,[1] was such, that no place, no time, no cause, no book, no person, either in public audience, or else in private company, made any mention of him, but thought himself even of very conscience bound to powder the same with manifold praises of his incomparable virtues and gifts of grace."[2] And again; "How happy are we Englishmen of such a king, in whose childhood appeareth as perfect grace, virtue, godly zeal, desire of literature, gravity, prudence, justice, and magnanimity, as hath heretofore been found in kings of most mature age, of full discretion, of ancient fame, and of passing high estimation." And again; "That God hath of singular favour and mercy towards this realm of England sent your grace to reign over us, the thing itself, by the whole process, doth declare."[2]

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 223 [vol. ii. p. 458].

[2] No. LXVIII.

The archbishop, his godfather, took exceeding complacency in a prince of such hopes, and would often congratulate Sir John Cheke, his schoolmaster, having such a scholar, even with tears. His instructors would somtimes give account to the archbishop of his proficiency in his studies, a thing that they knew would be acceptable to him. Thus did Dr. Cox, his tutor, in a letter acquaint the archbishop "of the prince's towardliness, godliness, gentleness, and all honest qualities; and that both the archbishop, and all the realm, ought to take him for a singular gift sent of God. That he read Cato, Vives' Satellitium, Æsop's Fables, and made Latin, besides things of the Bible; and that he conned pleasantly and perfectly."[3] The archbishop, out of his dear love to him, and to encourage him, would sometimes himself write in Latin to him; and one of his letters to him is yet extant in Fox.[1]

---

[1] Cooper's Chron. [part iii. 357].

[2] Nic. Udal's Preface to Erasm. Paraphrase [vol. i. 2].

[3] [Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 351.]

His great parts might be seen by his letters, journals, memorials, discourses, and writings; which were many: divers lost, but of those that are yet extant, these are the most:—

A letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, his godfather, from Ampthil, in Latin, being then but about seven years old.[2]

Another in Latin to the archbishop, from Hertford, which was an answer to one from the archbishop.[3]

A letter in French to his sister, the Lady Elizabeth, writ December 18, 1546.[4]

A letter to his uncle, the duke of Somerset, after his success against the Scots, 1547.[5]

To Queen Katharine Par, after her marriage with the lord admiral, his uncle.[6]

Another letter to her.[7]

A letter to the earl of Hartford, his cousin, in Latin.[8]

A letter to Barnaby Fitz-Patrick, concerning the duke of Somerset's arraignment.[9]

Another to B. Fitz-Patrick, consisting of instructions to him when he went to France.[10]

Another to Fitz-Patrick, giving him an account of his progress, in August, 1552.[11]

Orders concerning the habits and apparel of his subjects, according to their degrees and qualities.[12]

Mention is also made in the "History of the Reformation"[13] of letters in Latin to King Henry, his father, at eight years old,[14] and to Queen Katharine Par.[15]

His journal, writ all with his own hand, from the beginning of his reign, 1547, until the 28th of November, 1552.[16]

---

[1] Fox['s Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 351]. [2] [Id. p. 350.]
[3] [Id. ibid.] [4] Mr. Petit's MSS. [5] Sir W. H[icke's] MSS.
[6] Sir W. H[icke's] MSS. [7] Sir W. H[icke's] MSS.
[8] Sir W. H[icke's] MSS. [9] Fuller's Ch. Hist. [vol. iv. p. 84, 5].
[10] Fuller's Ch. Hist. [vol. iv. pp. 88—90].
[11] Ibid. [vol. iv. pp. 91—93]. [12] Mr. Petit's MSS. [13] [Vol. ii. p. 3.]
[14] [Fuller's Ch. Hist. vol. iv. pp. 114, 115.] [15] [Id. pp. 115, 116.]
[16] Cotton Lib. [MSS. Nero. C. x.] and Hist. Ref. vol. ii. part 2, pp. 3—100.

A collection of passages of Scripture against idolatry, in French; dedicated to the Protector.[17]

A discourse about the reformation of many abuses, both ecclesiastical and temporal.[18]

A reformation of the Order of the Garter; translated out of English into Latin by King Edward.[19] These four last are published in the "History of the Reformation," vol. ii. among the Collections.[20]

A book, written in French by him at twelve years of age, against the Pope, entitled, "A l'Encontre les Abus du Monde." [21]

A memorial, February 1551.[22]

Another memorial, dated October 13, 1552.[23]

Another memorial.[24]

His prayer a little before his death.[25]

I shall rehearse none of these writings, but only one of the memorials; because it bordereth so near upon our present history, and shows so much this young prince's care of religion, and for the good estate of the Church, animated, admonished, counselled, and directed in these matters by the archbishop.

For Religion. October 13, 1552.

I. A catechism to be set forth, for to be taught in all grammar-schools.

II. An uniformity of doctrine, to which all preachers should set their hands.

III. Commissions to be granted to those bishops that be grave, learned, wise, sober, and of good religion, for the executing of discipline.

IV. To find fault with the slightfulness of the pastors, and to deliver them articles of visitation, willing and commanding them to be more diligent in their office, and to keep more preachers.

---

[17] Trinity Coll. Libr. [See also Burnet's Hist. Reformat. vol. ii. part 2, pp. 101, 2].

[18] Cotton Libr. [MSS. Nero. C. ix. 107—111].

[19] Cotton Libr. [MSS. Nero. C. x. 93—101].

[20] [Vol. ii. part 2, pp. 102—115.]

[21] Sir W. H[icke's] MSS.

[22] [Ibid.]

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Fox['s Acts and Monuments, vol. vi. p. 352].

V. The abrogating of the old Canon-law, and establishing of a new.

VI. The dividing of the bishopric of Durham into two, and placing of men in them.

VII. The placing of Harley into the bishopric of Hereford.

VIII. The making of more homilies.

IX. The making of more injunctions.

X. The placing of one in a bishopric in Ireland, which Turner of Canterbury hath refused.

Some of these things were already done, and some in hand. Hereby we may see what further steps in the Reformation would have been made, had the good king lived. So that in this king's reign religion made a good progress, and superstition and idolatry were in a good manner purged out of the Church, which was the more to be wondered at, considering the minority of the king, the grievous factions at court, and the too-common practice then of scoffing and buffooning religion, and the more conscientious professors of it. For of this sort of men, ruffians and dissolute livers, there were many followed the court, and were favourites to the leading men there—I mean, the two dukes—and proved after base time-servers and flatterers in the reign of Queen Mary.

During this reign Archbishop Cranmer was a very active man, and great deference seemed to be given to his judgment, by the king and council, in the matters that were then transacting; especially as concerning the reformation of religion. For I find him very frequently at the Council-board, and often sent for thither, or sent unto when absent. And here I will not think much to set down all the particular days when, and places where, he was present in person with the privy-counsellors; from the year 1550 beginning, unto the middle of the year 1553, near the time of the king's death; as it was extracted carefully out of a Council-book, that commenceth at the above-said year.

Anno 1550. April 19, he was present at the Council then at Greenwich. This month one Putto, who had been put to silence for his lewd preaching [that is, against the steps made in the Reformation], and did now nevertheless, of his own head, preach as lewdly as he had done before, was referred to the archbishop, and the bishop of Ely, to be corrected, April 28. The archbishop present at council, May 2, 4, 7, 11 (on this day the duke of Somerset was called again to council), and 15. At the Star-chamber, May 16. At Westminster, May 28, June 5. At Greenwich, June 8, 11, 13, 20, 22. At Westminster, June 28, 29, 30, and July 1: about which time the archbishop seemed to depart into his diocese, and there to remain that summer. October 11, there was an Order of Council for a letter to be writ to him, in answer to his of complaint against the vicar of Dartford, to imprison him for his disobedience unto him; and in prison to endure, until the said archbishop should come to court. October 18, was another Order of Council for three letters to be writ, the one to the archbishop of Canterbury, another to the bishop of Ely, and another to the bishop of Lincoln. "Because (as the words run) the Parliament draweth near; before which time [it is by the king's] majesty thought expedient to have some matters there to be consulted. Their lordships were required immediately to repair to the court, where they shall understand his majesty's further pleasure. And [November 11] his grace was sent for."[1] At Westminster, November 16, 17, 18, 26. December 4, when the archbishop and bishop of Ely answered the bishop of Chichester, then before the council, as to the texts by him produced in behalf of altars. December 5, 9, 11, 13; on which day a letter was sent to the lieutenant of the Tower, to bring the bishop of Winchester to Lambeth before the archbishop. January 13, he was present at the council at Greenwich, when Hooper was ordered to be committed to the archbishop's custody. Present again at council at Greenwich, February 8. At Westminster the 16, 18; then, upon the report of the archbishop made of one Young, a learned man [I suppose he of Cambridge, that was Bucer's antagonist], viz. that he had preached seditiously [against the king's proceedings in religion], it was ordered that the archbishop, and the bishop of Ely, should examine him, and thereupon order him, as they should think good. He was present at Council, still at Westminster, March 4, 8 (when he was appointed to receive a sum of money in respect of his charges and pains in his process against the late bishop of Winchester, now deprived), 9, 11, 12, 22, 24.

---

[1] [The following note appears in the Eccl. History Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 437, at this place. "This passage has been corrected from the MSS. Council-Book;" Strype says, 'and that day his grace was sent for. November 11, he was present at the Council.' So far from this being the fact, the first proceeding of the Council, Nov. 11, 1550, was to this effect:—'This day the archbishop of Canterbury was sent for.' There is no allusion whatever to his being sent for Oct. 18, 1550. See fol. 145, 161." The corrections thus made have been adopted for this edition.]

Anno 1551. March 26, 31. At Greenwich, April the 8, 9, 11, 26. May 4, 10, 24, 25. June 4, 14 (when a letter was given to the archbishop to send to the lieutenant of the Tower, for the bringing White, warden of New College in Winchester, and delivering him to the archbishop, to remain with him till he might reclaim him),[1] 15, 21, 22. At Richmond, August 9. At Hampton Court, October 1: when a license was granted to Wolf, under the king's privilege, to print the archbishop's book. At Westminster, October 17, 19, 22, 28. November 2, 5, 9, 10, 15, 17, 21, 26. December 11, 12 (13 a letter was sent from the Council to the archbishop to send them a book touching religion sent out of Ireland), 17, 18, 19. January 24, 31. February 8, 16, 22, 28. March 22.

Anno 1552. He was present at the Council now sitting at Westminster, March 30. April 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 18, 19, 24. From which time till the month of October, he was not at the Council, and yet seems to have been at home. October 7, the Council sent to him to stay his going into Kent till Tuesday, because the lords would confer with him; that is, till October 11, when he was again present at Council. The archbishop now retired into his diocese, and was at his house at Ford, whither several messages and letters were sent to him from the Council: as, November 20, they sent him the Articles of Religion (framed chiefly by him, and reviewed by the king's chaplains), for his last review, in order to the putting them into due execution. November 24, another sent him, according to the minute, of some business unknown.

---

[1] This note also occurs in the Eccl. History Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 438. "Strype is in error as to Cranmer's appearance at the Council on the 14th and 15th of June, 1551. No further mention of him is made in the MSS. Council-Book of the 14th June, than that the letter above referred to was directed to be sent to him. See fol. 327."]

December 2, another letter to him for the installing of Hooper, without paying any fees. And another, February 2, in favour of Mr. Knox, to be by him collated to the living of All-hallows. This month he returned, and was at the Council at Westminster. Likewise February 21, 22, 25, 27, 28.

Anno 1553. March 25. April 1, 7. At Greenwich, June 2, 3, 6, 8; and that was the last time mentioned in the Council-Book, ending at June 17. Nor cared he to come afterwards, the business then in transaction not pleasing him.

A Bishop consecrated.

May 26. John Harley, S.T.P. was consecrated (and was the last that was consecrated in this king's reign), bishop of Hereford, upon the death of Skip, by the archbishop, at Croyden chapel; Nicolas [Ridley], bishop of London; and Robert [Aldrich], bishop of Carlisle, assisting.[1] This Harley was one of the king's six chaplains, Bill, Bradford, Grindal, Pern, and Knox,[2] being the other five that were appointed to be itineraries, to preach sound doctrine in all the remotest parts of the kingdom, for the instruction of the ignorant in right religion to God, and obedience to the king.

---

[1] [Cranm. Regist. 335.]

[2] [See above, pp. 394, 423.]

The end of the Second Book.

WHARTON'S OBSERVATIONS.

[The following portion of the corrections of Wharton, on "The Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer," are given in illustration of the statements of the text, which appear in the first volume.]

READER,—My reverend friend Mr. Wharton, as he formerly encouraged and assisted me in the foregoing history, hath also further obliged me by the perusal of it, and by communicating to me his ingenious and learned observations and animadversions thereupon, which do highly deserve to be made more public; and therefore are here gladly added by me (together with his letter), as a supplement to my book, for the reader's benefit.

TO THE REVEREND MR. STRIPE.

SIR,—At the desire of Mr. Chiswell, our common friend, I have perused your "Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer," not without great satisfaction; being much pleased to see the actions of that excellent prelate, and the affairs of the Reformation of our Church, happily begun and carried on in his time, and by his conduct, disposed in so clear a method. I have not been able to make my observations upon it with that exactness and fulness which I desired, and you may perhaps expect; being at this time placed at a very great distance from all my papers and collections, and not enjoying the use even of such printed books as would be necessary to this design: so that I have been forced to pass by very many places of your history, wherein I have suspected some error to have been committed, but could not either confirm or remove my suspicion for want of farther present evidence. However, I have noted several places, which at first reading appeared suspicious, and after farther consideration were judged erroneous by me; although even in some of those places I have only pointed at the error, not being able always to rectify it, without the assistance of books and papers, whereof I am now wholly destitute. Be pleased to accept of my performance herein with that candour wherewith I read your book, and made the following observations; since I willingly profess, that the commission of errors in writing any history, especially of times past, being altogether unavoidable, ought not to detract from the credit of the history, or merit of the historian; unless it be accompanied with immoderate ostentation, or unhandsome reflections upon the errors of others; from which imputation, that indifference and candour which appear throughout your whole work, wholly exempt you; although no history of those matters or times, which I have seen, be wrote with equal exactness.

PAGE 22, line 12. "It is the sense of an ingenious and learned friend of mine, that the pretended martyr, Thomas Becket, though he died in vindication of the privileges of the Church, yet he was the first betrayer of the rights of his see; viz. of Canterbury. He made the greatest breach upon the authority of the primacy of Canterbury, by resigning the archbishopric into the Pope's hands, and receiving it again from him, as the Pope's donation."] Thomas Becket was not the first nor the chief betrayer of the rights of the see of Canterbury. The first and greatest breach upon the authority of the primacy of that see was made by his predecessor William de Corboil, thirty-seven years before, who, after he had been fully invested in the archbishopric of Canterbury by due authority, solicited and accepted the bulls of Pope Honorius (II.), conferring it upon him as by papal gift, and other bulls, constituting him the Pope's legate in England; whereby he subjected his own see and the Church of England to the authority of the see of Rome, which were before wholly independent of it.

Page 30, line 20. "The twelfth article of Cranmer's judgment of the unlawfulness of King Henry's marriage, is this: 'We think that the pretended matrimony of King Henry, &c. hath been and is none at all.'"] You will please to consider whether the Latin words, *fuisse et esse nullum*, should not have been rather translated, *hath been and is null;* which is the canonical term expressing voidance in law.

Page 33, line 34. "Licenses were granted this year [1533] to the Lady Guilford, and to the marchioness of Dorset in 1534, to have the eucharist &c. ministered to them in their private chapels. Whether indulged to them by the archbishop, the rather to free them from danger for not frequenting their parish-churches, and for the avoiding the superstitious and idolatrous worship there performed, &c. or only for the convenience of those ladies, the reader hath liberty to judge."] The archbishop cannot be hence supposed to have countenanced any separation from the parochial worship of that time, or to have insinuated his judgment of the danger, superstition, or idolatry of the public worship then used; since such licenses were customary acts, very frequent before and at that time. Many hundreds of them may be found among the faculties granted by the predecessors of this archbishop more than two hundred years upwards. Private oratories were then more used, and domestic chaplains entertained in much greater number than in latter times: yet none then presumed to make use of either, without license first obtained of their diocesans; which discipline was formerly observed by all strictly, and continued in great measure till the time of Archbishop Abbot, although now little regarded. So that hereby Archbishop Cranmer gave no occasion for any such conjecture as is here made, any more than Archbishop Parker did when he granted a like license to his own wife, although she was no Puritan, or separatist from the established worship.

Page 36, line 30. "This year [1534], all the learned and spiritual men in England subscribed to it with their hands, that the Pope hath no jurisdiction in this kingdom. The archbishop's church in Canterbury began; for the prior and convent thereof solemnly subscribed an instrument for abolishing the Pope's supremacy, &c. The original whereof is in a volume of the Cotton library."] The right reverend the bishop of Salisbury, in his History of the Reformation, giveth two or three such instruments of the subscription of so many particular convents, and supposeth that no more remain, but that all the rest were in the reign of Queen Mary destroyed by Bishop Bonner, by virtue of a commission granted to him for razing of scandalous records. In truth, all those instruments do yet remain, and are a most authentic justification of the proceedings of the king in abolishing the papal supremacy. The originals of them do yet remain in their proper place, the king's exchequer, into which they were at first returned, and where they have been hitherto kept. There are in my hands no less than one hundred and seventy-five such instruments, transcribed long since from thence, containing the subscriptions of all the bishops, chapters, monasteries, colleges, hospitals, &c. of thirteen dioceses. The subscriptions of those of the other nine dioceses are to my certain knowledge yet remaining in another place, but I have not yet gained copies of them. Some of these instruments have been transcribed into the volume of the Cotton library here mentioned; but that is only a transcript, containeth not the originals, as is here supposed. Nor did the church of Canterbury begin the subscription; for however the instrument of that church may be placed first, upon account of the pre-eminence of it, the instruments of several religious houses, even in that diocese, are dated before it.

Page 42, line 11. "Nix, bishop of Norwich, died two years after, September 1534, and came in to be bishop in the year 1500."] He died in the middle of January, 153$\frac{5}{6}$; and was consecrated bishop in April 1501.

Page 46, line 29. "The archbishop began his provincial visitation *jure metropolitico*, the last year 1534. It was somewhat extraordinary; for such a visitation had not been in an hundred years before.—The diocese of Winchester having been visited but five years ago by his predecessor Warham."] The archbishop, in his letter in answer to the bishop of Winchester, in the Appendix (No. xiv.), saith truly, that the diocese of Winchester was visited by his predecessor Warham the third year before this. But when he addeth, that else it had not been visited by any of his predecessors these forty years, he is to be understood cautiously. For although perhaps it had not been visited by any archbishop since the death of Bishop Langton, which was in the year 1493, yet it had been visited *metropolitico* by the chapter of Canterbury, in the beginning of the year 1501. Again, when it is said from Bishop Stokesley's letter in the Appendix (No. xv.), that such a provincial visitation had not been held by any of the archbishop's predecessors in an hundred years before ; this also is to be understood dexterously. For men in their juridical answers are wont to allege anything which may seem to make for their cause, little regarding whether it be exactly true or no. It is true, the archbishops of Canterbury had not for so long a time undertaken or performed a metropolitical visitation of their whole province at one time ; but they had often within that time visited particular dioceses *jure metropolitico ;* which was a sufficient precedent to the cause then in hand.

Page 52, line 11. "Suffragan bishops were not unusual in the realm. —To give some instances of them.—Certain, bearing the title of bishops of Sidon, assisted the archbishops of Canterbury. One of these was named Thomas Wellys, prior of St. Gregory's by Canterbury ; he, being Archbishop Warham's chaplain, was sent by him, &c.—There was afterwards one Christopher that bore that title, and assisted Archbishop Cranmer about these times [1535] in ordinations ; and another Thomas, entitled also of Sidon, succeeded."] It should seem to be here supposed that the suffragans of the diocese of Canterbury did then commonly take their titles from Sidon ; whereas, indeed, none of them (save that Thomas Wellys here mentioned) was entitled from thence. As for Christopher, he was not suffragan to the archbishops of Canterbury ; and that other Thomas of Sidon was in Cranmer's time suffragan to the bishops of London. That Thomas Wellys, moreover, who was prior of St. Gregory's, and titular bishop of Sidon, was not chaplain to Archbishop Warham ; for archbishops never entertained regulars in the quality of chaplains. Archbishop Warham had indeed a chaplain of that name, but he was neither prior nor bishop, but a secular, doctor of divinity, and rector of Chartham, near Canterbury.

Page 52, line 28. "Long before these, I find one William Bottlesham Episcopus Navatensis, anno 1382, at the Convocation in London, summoned against the Wickliffites."] If this were a titular bishop only, he had nothing to do in the Convocation, nor any right to be summoned to it. That Willelmus Bottlesham, Episcopus Navarensis, was in truth no other than Willelmus Episcopus Landavensis, bishop of Landaff, whose title of *Landavensis* the ignorance or mistake of the scribe changed into *Navatensis*. By a like mistake, very frequent in our ancient records, the bishop of Lincoln, *Lincolniensis*, is corruptly styled *Nicoliensis.*

Page 53, line 6. "John Thornden, who was often commissary of Oxon, while Archbishop Warham was chancellor of that university, was styled Episcopus Syrinensis."] His name was John Thornton. Many years after him, Richard Thornton was suffragan bishop in the diocese of Canterbury. In Thornton endeth the catalogue of suffragan bishops, which you could find, consecrated before the time of Archbishop Cranmer, being in all seven. If it pleaseth God to permit me to finish my *Anglia Sacra*, I shall exhibit a perfect succession of suffragan bishops in almost all the dioceses of England, for about two hundred years before the Reformation.

Ibid, line 8. "And hereafter we shall meet with a bishop of Hippolitanum, who assisted Archbishop Cranmer at his ordinations."] It will be hard to find such a city as Hippolitanum in the world. We had in England many suffragan bishops, who successively assumed the title of bishops of Hippo, the see of the great S. Austin. These were wont to style themselves Hipponenses; but some of them, not being so good grammarians, took the style of Ypolitanenses, and Hippolitanenses; which latter appellation might give occasion to the mistake concerning a bishop of Hippolitanum.

Page 56, line 5. "The king sent to the archbishop to make Thomas Manning suffragan of Gipwich: who was accordingly consecrated by the archbishop."] This Gipwich is no other than Ipswich, the chief town of Suffolk, in Latin called Gipesvicum and Gipwicum; from which place Manning, at his promotion to the office of a suffragan bishop, took his title.

Page 59, line 11. "This choice treasure [the original book, containing the subscription of the members of the Convocation to certain articles of religion] Sir Robert Cotton afterwards procured. And at the bottom of the first page is written, *Robertus Cotton Bruceus*, by Sir Robert's own hand, signifying his value of this monument."] Sir Robert did not by that subscription of his name testify any extraordinary value of this volume: for he wrote the same words at the bottom of the first page of all, or almost all, the manuscript volumes of his library.

Page 72, line 28. "June——anno 1536. William Rugg was consecrated bishop of Norwich. His consecration is omitted in the Register. Probably he was consecrated with Sampson bishop of Chichester, who was confirmed June 10th."] Rugg could not be consecrated in June, for he was not confirmed till the 28th of that month; and the first Sunday after that day was July 2nd. Bishops were wont to be consecrated on the next Sunday after their confirmation. So that it is most likely Sampson was consecrated June 11th; and Rugg, together with Warton of St. Asaph, on July 2nd.

Page 87, line 18. "It was now forbidden by the Parliament, that the feast of St. Thomas à Becket, the pretended martyr, should be celebrated any more." He is also styled Thomas à Becket, page 101, lines 5 and 13, and page 133, line 7, &c. This is a small error; but being so often repeated, deserveth to be observed and corrected. The name of that archbishop was Thomas Becket; nor can it otherwise be found to have been written in any authentic history, record, calendar, or other book. If the vulgar did formerly, as it doth now, call him Thomas a Becket, their mistake is not to be followed by learned men.

Page 88, line 13. "June 24, anno 1537. John Bird was consecrated suffragan of the see of Penrith, in Landaff diocese; and Lewis Thomas suffragan bishop of the see of Salop."] It should have been said, that Bird was consecrated suffragan of the diocese of Landaff, with the title of bishop of Penrith; and Thomas consecrated suffragan of the diocese of St. Asaph, with the title of bishop of Shrewsbury (not Salop); for Penrith is no more in Landaff diocese, than Shrewsbury is in that of St. Asaph. But it may be observed, that in the first Act of Parliament made in this reign touching suffragan bishops, certain titles were appointed, to which the said suffragans should be consecrated, taken from several of the chief towns in England; but it was not required that the suffragan of any particular diocese should take his title from some town in that diocese, but was left at liberty to take it from any town mentioned in that Act. Which was accordingly practised indifferently till the promulgation of the second Act concerning suffragans.

Page 90, line 9. "The reason why Archbishop Cranmer all this while, that is, from the first making the Act concerning suffragans in the year 1534, to this time [1597], had nominated none for suffragan to this see [Dover] till now (when he nominated and consecrated Richard Yngworth in December), might be, because there seemed to be a suffragan already, even the same that had been in the time of Archbishop Warham, namely, John Thornton, prior of Dover; who was one of the witnesses appointed by that archbishop to certify what was found and seen at the opening of St. Dunstan's tomb. Richard Thornden seems to have succeeded Yngworth in this office."] St. Dunstan's tomb was opened in April 1508, and Thornden died not till the last year of Queen Mary: so that if to Thornton succeeded Yngworth, and to Yngworth succeeded Thornden, there will be no room for any of those three bishops of Sidon, who were before in this history, page 52, said to have assisted the archbishops Warham and Cranmer in the quality of suffragan bishops. For the very first of them, Thomas Wellys, was suffragan bishop after the year 1508. I know not when he was made suffragan, or when he died; but I am certain that he survived the year 1511. As for Christopher, and the other, Thomas, bishops of Sidon, they indeed were not the peculiar suffragans of the archbishops of Canterbury, as I before said. (See above, p. 440.)

Page 91, line 6. "March 24, 1537, Henry Holbeach was consecrated suffragan bishop of Bristow, in the bishop of London's chapel, in the said bishop's house, situate in Lambeth-marsh, by the said bishop, &c." The bishops of London never had any house situate in Lambeth-marsh, but the bishops of Rochester at that time had; which house was soon after conveyed from the see of Rochester to the crown; and afterwards from the crown by exchange to the see of Carlisle, to which it now belongeth.

Page 125, line 3. "In this consecration [of Bonner bishop of London, anno 1540], the prior and chapter of Canterbury insisted, it seems, upon an ancient privilege of their church, which I do not find in this Register [that of Archbishop Cranmer] they had at other consecrations done; namely, that the consecration should be celebrated at the church of Canterbury, and at no other church or oratory, without their allowance. And so, in a formal instrument, they gave their license and consent.———The renewing of this their old pretended privilege looked like some check to the archbishop, and as though they required of him a sort of dependence on them now more than before; and it showed some secret ill-will towards him."] This privilege was first granted to the prior and chapter of Canterbury by Thomas Becket, but afterwards more amply confirmed to them by St. Edmund the archbishop, in the year 1235; from which time to the present year 1540, I dare confidently aver, that no bishop of the province of Canterbury had been consecrated by the archbishops, or by any other by their commission, in any church or place without the metropolitical church of Canterbury, without license first desired and obtained in writing from the chapter of Canterbury under their seal; if we except only two or three cases between the years 1235 and 1300; which were the occasions of great controversies between the archbishops consecrating, and the bishops consecrated, on the one part, and the chapter of Canterbury on the other part; which yet always ended to the advantage of the chapter, and the farther confirmation of their privilege herein. If these licenses be not registered in the archbishops' Registers, it is not to be wondered at; it being not their concern to cause those things to be enregistered, which were not essential to the confirmation or consecration of the bishops of their province, but related merely to the privileges of the chapter of Canterbury. But they are all enregistered, and may be found in the Registers of that chapter. If therefore the prior and convent of Canterbury did at this time require Bonner to take out such a license before his consecration, they thereby gave no more evidence of any sinister design or ill-will against the archbishop, than they had done at any time before to him or any of his predecessors for 300 years, whensoever any bishop of the province was to be consecrated out of their church.

Page 137, line 32. "Robert King, titular Bishop Reonen, suffragan to the bishop of Lincoln, was this year [1541] consecrated bishop of Oxford. The date, or his consecrators, I cannot assign, the act being omitted in the archbishop's Register."] Whensoever a suffragan bishop was promoted to any real bishopric, he had no need of any new consecration, the character and order of bishop having been all along as full, valid, and effectual in him, as in any bishop whatsoever. So that in such a promotion no other form was observed, than in the translation of any bishop from one diocese to another; viz. election and confirmation. But in this case not so much as that was neccssary; for the bishopric of Oxford being then newly erected, King, the first bishop of it, was to be put in possession of it, not by any act of the archbishop's, but by letters patents of the king, the founder of it; which letters were not issued out until the first day of September in the following year.

Page 160, line 29. "The names of the chief actors [of a conspiracy against the archbishop] were Thornden, who lived in the archbishop's family, and eat at his table, and with whom he used to converse most familiarly." So also page 174, line 4. "Thornton, who was suffragan of Dover, the archbishop made prebendary of his church, and whom he always set at his own mess." Page 172, line 23. "Dr. Thornton, who was very great with the archbishop, but secretly false to him." Vol. ii. in loco. "This had the suffragan of Dover, Dr. Thornton, done."] In these and other passages of this history the names and persons of Dr. Thornton and Dr. Thornden, both suffragans of the diocese of Canterbury, are confounded. John Thornton, prior of Dover, was suffragan to Archbishop Warham, and died in his time. Richard Thornden was monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, and at the dissolution of that monastery in 1539, or 1540, and conversion of it into a college of secular canons, was constituted the first prebendary of it, and soon after made suffragan of the diocese, with the title of bishop of Dover; in which office he continued till his death, *ultimo Mariæ.* He never lived in the archbishop's family, but in the monastery till the dissolution of it; and after that constantly resided upon his prebend and other benefices which he held in the diocese. You might perhaps find it noted, that the archbishop always set him at his own mess; which might give you occasion to think that he sometimes lived in the archbishop's family: whereas indeed no more was meant thereby, than that the archbishop was wont to show to him extraordinary respect, whensoever he attended him: for in those days suffragan bishops, however usual, were treated with contempt enough, not wont to be admitted to dine at the archbishop's own table in the hall of the archbishop's palace. There were generally three tables spread in the archbishop's hall, and served at the same time: the archbishop's table, at which ordinarily sate none but peers of the realm, privy counsellors, and gentlemen of the greatest quality. The almoner's table, at which sate the chaplains, and all guests of the clergy beneath diocesan bishops, and abbots. The steward's table, at which sate all other gentlemen. The suffragan bishops then were wont to sit at the almoner's table; and the archbishop, in admitting his suffragan Thornden to his own table, did him an unusual honour; which was therefore noted to aggravate the ingratitude of the man, conspiring against the archbishop.

Page 181, line 38. "About this time [1544] it was, I conjecture, that the king changed the archbishop's coat of arms; for unto the year 1543, he bore his paternal coat of three cranes sable, as I find by a date set under his arms, yet remaining in a window in Lambeth House."] Those arms of Archbishop Cranmer, here mentioned to remain in a window in Lambeth House, together with the arms of the archbishops succeeding to him since the Reformation, and placed in the same window, were painted at the cost of, and set up by my Lord Archbishop Sancroft, not many years since.

Page 201, line 12. "One of the very first things that was done in King Edward's reign, in relation to the Church, was, that the bishops, &c. should be made to depend entirely upon the king and his council, &c. and should take commissions from him for the exercise of their office and jurisdiction, and those to last only during the king's pleasure.—In this I suppose the archbishop had his hand.—And therefore he began this matter with himself,—petitioning for such a commission,—which was granted to him, Feb. 7, 1546."] This matter was not now first begun or done. The archbishop and all the bishops of England had taken commissions from King Henry, in the very same form, *mutatis mutandis,* in the year 1535.

Page 228, line 16. "An English exile, naming himself E. P., in Queen Mary's days published again the archbishop's book against Unwritten Verities, and prefixed to it a preface of his own.—I will add one passage taken out of this book, about the middle, whereby it may be seen what a clergy was now in England. He makes a heavy complaint against the frequent practice of beastly sins in the priests, adultery, sodomy, &c., and that they never were punished. 'And in my memory [as he proceeds], which is above thirty years, and also by the information of others, that be twenty years older than I, I could never learn that one priest was punished."] These exiles are a sort of men who generally write with passion and prejudice against their own country; so that ordinarily little more credit is to be given to their information than to the intelligence of deserters from an army. I am sure he hath shamefully belied the clergy of England in accusing them of the frequent practice of such beastly sins, and then affirming that he could never learn that one priest was punished for it in the space of fifty years before that time. It is true, that crimes of incontinence, as such, especially in the clergy, were then cognoscible and punishable only by the ecclesiastical law, and in the spiritual courts; but rapes were then, as well as now, in clergymen as well as laymen, triable and punishable at common law. And of this the laity took such malicious advantage, immediately before the Reformation, that they were wont to pretend all acts, and even indications of incontinence in clergymen, to be so many rapes, and to indict them as such; insomuch that scarce any assizes or sessions passed at that time, wherein several clergymen were not indicted of rapes, and a jury of laymen empannelled to try them, who would be sure not to be guilty of showing overmuch favour to them in their verdicts. Neither was the ecclesiastical authority then so remiss (as is pretended), as not to have punished any one priest for incontinence within the space of fifty years before: if I had my papers by me, I could produce examples of many incontinent clergymen punished and deprived by their ordinaries within that time. About this very time wherein this preface was wrote, Dr. Weston, although otherwise a man of great note and interest among the Popish party, was deprived of the deanery of Windsor, for a single act of incontinence; and about twenty years before this, Stokesley bishop of London is by John Bale reported to have deprived John lord abbot of Colchester for an horrible act of incontinence. Indeed I know Bale to have been so great a liar, that I am not willing to take anything of that kind upon his credit; however, his testimony may serve well enough against such another foul-mouthed writer as this E. P. seems to have been.

Page 231, line 13. "The archbishop supplied the city of Canterbury with store of excellent learned preachers, Turner, the two Ridleys, Becon, &c."] Turner never was preacher in ordinary at Canterbury, but at Chartham, near Canterbury. He is said indeed afterwards in this History to have been one of the six preachers at the church of Canterbury; which may be true: yet to preach there three or four sermons in a year, upon so many holydays, is not a sufficient ground to say, that that city was supplied with such or such preachers.

Page 235, line 34. "The University of Cambridge laboured under great suspicions of being spoiled of its revenues; she having observed how those of her sister, the Church, were daily invaded by secular hands."] The University hath ever been so dutiful, as to own the Church to be her mother.

Page 264, line 16. "Farrar was consecrated bishop of St. David's, by Thomas archbishop of Canterbury, endued with his pontificals."] The latter words are a translation of *pontificalibus indutus*, which signifies no other than being invested or attired in his episcopal habit.

Page 265, line 18. "Bishop Farrar hearing of great corruption among those belonging to the chapter of the church of Carmarthen, and chiefly Thomas Young, chanter, after archbishop of York, &c."] I suppose the chapter of the church of St. David's is here meant; for there was no such church at Carmarthen, and Young was at this time precentor of St. David's.

Page 300, line 24. "Bishop Ridley, at his entrance upon the see of London, was exceeding wary not to do his predecessor Bonner the least injury, but rather did many kindnesses to his mother, servants, and relations; he continued Bonner's receiver, one Staunton, in his place."] In this last case Ridley could not give any evidence of kindness or unkindness; for Staunton held his place of receiver by patent for life.

Page 323, line 27. "The council sitting at Greenwich, the bishop's [Gardiner of Winchester] servants came, and desired that certain of them might be sworn upon certain articles for witness on his behalf. And if they might not be sworn, &c. And they were allowed."] From this relation any reader would imagine, that the bishop's servants desired that themselves might be sworn in behalf of their lord and master: whereas in the Council-Book (from whence this matter is reported), it is plain, that they desired that some of the privy councillors might be sworn, or at least be obliged to declare upon their honour what they knew of the matter then in question, in favour of the bishop.

Page 385, line 41. "This Scory [bishop elect of Rochester] was at first preferred by the archbishop to be one of the six preachers at Canterbury, and always continued firm for the purity of religion, and endured trouble for it.—He was a married man, and so deprived at beginning of Queen Mary's reign, fled beyond sea, &c."] Scory was so far from continuing always firm to the purity of religion, that in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign he reconciled himself to the see of Rome, submitted himself to Bishop Bonner, made a formal recantation, and did open penance for his marriage; however, afterwards he resumed his former principles, when he had got beyond sea.

Page 390, line 31. "All this I have related of this divine, [Dr. John Redman, who died in 1551], that I may in some measure preserve the memory of one of the learnedest men of his time; and lay up the dying words of a Papist, signifying so plainly his dislike and disallowance of many of their doctrines."] I cannot imagine why Dr. Redman should be accounted or called a Papist at the time of his death, who had all along lived, and then died, in the communion of the Established Church, and had but little before joined with the archbishop, and other bishops and divines, in compiling the Book of Common Prayer. If because he had once held the Popish doctrines concerning justification, the sacrament of the altar, &c.; with equal and for the same reason Cranmer himself, and all the bishops and eminent divines of that time, may be called Papists; or if it was because he judged it unlawful for any priest to marry a second time (as is related page 222), he therein followed the canons and received doctrine of the ancient Church, and hath many learned and worthy divines of our own time and Church concurring with him in the same opinion.

Page 397, line 10. "The other was Richard Turner, in former time curate of Chartham, in Kent, and commonly called Turner of Canterbury, living in the family of Mr. Morice, the archbishop's secretary, who held the impropriation of that parsonage, and had presented this man to the vicarage."] It would be very ill for me, if the parsonage of Chartham were impropriate; it never yet was, and, as I hope, never shall be in the possession of a layman. Mr. Morice only held it at that time by lease of Richardson, the rector of it, with obligation to provide and pay a curate, which was this Turner.

Page 398, line 6. "And this I judge to be that Turner whom the archbishop nominated for Ireland [to the archbishopric of Armagh], having lived long in his diocese, and so well known to him; and whom he had, I suppose, removed to Canterbury, to a prebend, or some other preferment there."] He never was prebendary of Canterbury.

Page 404, line 11. "While King Edward was in his progress [1552], some about his person, to make the better way for their sacrilegious designs, and to make the king the more inclinable to lay hands on the episcopal demeans, or at least to clip and pare them, buzzed about rumours, &c.——This Sir William Cecil, the secretary, who was now with the king, laboured to hinder; for he was a very great favourer, as of the Reformed clergy, so of their estate and honours."] He gave but bad evidence of such favour to the clergy and estate of the Church, when, many years after this (the revenue of the Church being then also much more diminished than it was at the time of this design), he tore away from the bishopric of Peterborough the far better part of the lands and revenues wherewith it had been endowed; which he effected by procuring Bishop Scambler to be translated from thence to Norwich; which translation, by the baseness of that bishop, conspiring with the sacrilegious greediness of two potent courtiers, was the ruin of both those bishoprics.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY COX (BROTHERS) AND WYMAN, GREAT QUEEN STREET.

Date Due

8 - '39			

BW2041 .S92 v.1
Memorials of the most reverend father in
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00071 2085